

Mr. WHITE. May I say just a word before I make the motion?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I ask the Senator not to make a point of order.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not going to make a point of order. I merely wish to say that I am glad that the Senator from Maine is getting over on this side of the aisle. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the RECORD show that the Senator from Maine has returned to the other side of the aisle.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to say to Senators that the kindly things they have said about me personally, and which have distinguished their attitude during the entire time I have been here, amply repay me and atone for any moments of embarrassment I have suffered this afternoon.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not wish to let this occasion pass without making a brief observation. I have not joined in the general compliments to the Senator from Maine, and have not said a word. However, I wish to add that everything that has been said about his fine spirit of leadership and his spirit as a Senator and gentleman meets with my full and complete accord. I wish I could add something that would really give the Senator the praise to which he is fairly and justly entitled.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I repeat with added emphasis all I said a moment ago in expression of my gratitude and appreciation for the kindly things Senators have always said and the courtesies which they have always shown me.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if we have reached an understanding, I move, as in legislative session, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 15, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 14 (legislative day of May 21), 1947:

##### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert A. Lovett, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State, vice Dean G. Acheson, resigned.

##### INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Andrew N. Overby, of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed, vice Harry D. White, resigned.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 14 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Stanton Griffiths to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Poland.

George R. Merrell to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

##### TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Edwin A. Plitt  
Charles H. Derry

##### TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Richard D. Gatewood	John Frémont Melby
Douglas Jenkins, Jr.	Bolard More
John D. Jernegan	Miss Katherine E. O'Connor
J. Jefferson Jones 3d	J. Graham Parsons
Charles R. Burrows	Halleck L. Rose
William F. Busser	Fred K. Salter
Robert P. Chalker	William P. Snow
Giljon Curtis, Jr.	David A. Thomasson
Philip M. Davenport	
Miss Constance R. Harvey	

##### TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 3, CONSUL, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Albert E. Clattenburg, Jr.

##### TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 3

William K. Allshie	Douglas MacArthur 2d
E. Tomlin Bailey	Elbert G. Mathews
Ralph J. Blake	Gordon H. Mattison
Carl H. Boehringer	Brewster H. Morris
Niles W. Bond	Robert Newbegin
Charles R. Burrows	J. Graham Parsons
Richard W. Byrd	Marsells C. Parsons, Jr.
John Willard Carrigan	G. Frederick Reinhardt
Norris B. Chipman	Arthur L. Richards
Walter C. Dowling	Livingston Satterthwaite
John K. Emmerson	George F. Scherer
Andrew B. Foster	Donald W. Smith
Norris S. Haselton	William P. Snow
L. Randolph Higgs	Philip D. Sprouse
Outerbridge Horsey	Carl W. Strom
John D. Jernegan	Clare H. Timberlake
U. Alexis Johnson	Ivan B. White
George Lewis Jones, Jr.	Evan M. Wilson

##### TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 3, A CONSUL, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

William Bruce Lockling

##### TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 4, CONSUL, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Clarence Boonstra	Hugh D. Farley
Willard O. Brown	John C. Payne
Joseph L. Dougherty	Edward J. Rowell

##### TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 5, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Wymberley DeR. Coerr  
Charles Robert Moore  
H. André Weismann

##### TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Arthur B. Allen	John Calvin Hill, Jr.
John A. Armitage	Elmer C. Hulen
Denis A. Baumhover	John A. McKesson III
William B. Cobb, Jr.	Paul M. Miller
Richard T. Davies	Miss Susannah Mirick
Lambert John Eichner, Jr.	B. Frank Poe, Jr.
Baird E. Emmons	Wells Stabler

##### TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 1

Paul H. Alling	David McK. Key
Charles E. Bohlen	Edward B. Lawson
William W. Butterworth, Jr.	Warwick Perkins
John M. Cabot	Edwin A. Plitt
Paul C. Daniels	Karl L. Rankin
Howard Donovan	James W. Riddleberger

##### TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 2

Theodore C. Achilles	Homer M. Byington, Jr.
John M. Allison	
H. Merrell Benninghoff	Cavendish V. Cannon
James C. H. Bonbright	Vinton Chapin
Philip W. Bonsal	Warren M. Chase
John H. Bruins	Oliver Edmund Clubb

William P. Cochran, Jr.  
Robert D. Coe  
Gerald A. Drew  
Everett F. Drumright  
Elbridge Durbrow  
Walton C. Ferris  
Raymond A. Hare  
Cloyce K. Huston  
Gerald Keith  
John B. Ketcham  
Charles F. Knox, Jr.  
Foy D. Kohler

Hervé J. L'Heureux  
John H. Madonne  
Sheldon T. Mills  
Harold B. Minor  
James K. Penfield  
Guy W. Ray  
Edward J. Sparks  
Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr.  
Edward T. Wailes  
Thomas C. Wasson  
James M. Wright

##### TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 4

Charles W. Adair, Jr.	J. Jefferson Jones 3d
H. Gardner Ainsworth	M. Gordon Knox
John H. Burns	William L. Krieg
Donald B. Calder	Sidney K. Lafoon
V. Lansing Collins, Jr.	Donald W. Lamm
Leonard J. Cromie	Robert H. McBride
Richard H. Davis	David H. McKillop
Irvn M. Eitrelm	John M. McSweeney
Robert S. Folsom	Albert E. Pappano
Edward L. Freers	Milton C. Rappin
Paul E. Geier	Stuart W. Rockwell
Lewis E. Gleeck, Jr.	William Langdon Sands
Richard E. Gnade	Bromley K. Smith
Caspar D. Green	Henry T. Smith
Franklin Hawley	John W. Tuthill
Martin J. Hillenbrand	J. Kittredge Vinson
John P. Hoover	William W. Walker
John Evarts Horner	Fraser Wilkins
Richard A. Johnson	

##### TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 5

Alvin M. Bentley	Charles E. Hulick, Jr.
Donald C. Bergus	Armistead M. Lee
W. Wendell Blancké	George T. Lister
Thomas D. Bowie	Rupert A. Lloyd
Howard Brandon	Albert K. Ludy, Jr.
Herbert D. Brewster	LaRue R. Lutkins
William C. Burdett, Jr.	James G. McCargar
George Carnahan	Cleveland B. McKnight
David P. Coffin	James L. O'Sullivan
A. John Cope, Jr.	Henry L. Pitts, Jr.
Robert F. Corrigan	Ralph A. Schweitzer
Forrest N. Daggett	Cabot Sedgwick
Robert J. Dorr	Richard M. Service
Donald A. Dumont	Robert M. Sheehan
John F. Fitzgerald	Harold Sims
William J. Ford	Douglas N. Forman, Jr.
Douglas N. Forman, Jr.	J. Ramon Solana
David L. Gamon	Herbert D. Spivack
Michael R. Gannett	Norman C. S'ines, Jr.
William C. George	Weldon Litsey
Charles C. Gidney, Jr.	Richard E. Usher
Thomas A. Goldman	Sheldon B. Vance
Marshall Green	Edward L. Waggoner
Joseph N. Greene, Jr.	Harvey R. Wellman
J. Brock Havron	George M. Widney
Douglas Henderson	William A. Wieland
J. William Henry	

##### TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

William M. Bates	Bruce M. Lancaster
Robert O. Blake	Miss Constance McCready
Philip J. Halla	John B. McGrath
Raymond J. Harris	James D. Newton
Robert S. Henderson	Kenedon P. Steins
Peter Hooper, Jr.	
Warren A. Kelsey	

##### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

William E. Warne to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

##### CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Samuel N. Karrick to be a member, California Debris Commission.

##### ATTORNEY GENERAL OF PUERTO RICO

Luis Negron Fernandez to be Attorney General of Puerto Rico.

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Owen McIntosh Burns to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania.

##### UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Otto F. Heine to be a United States marshal for the district of Hawaii.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O King Eternal, as we come to our duties, take our thoughts, our motives, and our labors, that we may continue them with Thy blessed approval. At times we desire to do that which is beyond our strength; be gracious to accept the wish when we fail to do the deed. Let us feel Thy great mercy stirring the depths of our souls in closer dedication to our God and our country.

Do Thou endow us plenteously with those gifts which enlighten the mind, that we may realize that the world has no lasting honors for those who seek only self, while those who interpret their surplus as another's need will awake to find themselves immortal. Dear Lord, human hearts are failing, but in Thy sight no life is common or worthless; so bless us with the inspiration of hope and with a sense of dignity, that we may be real and abiding contributions to the moral and spiritual forces of our land.

Through Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 16, 1947:

H. R. 1943. An act to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army.

On April 25, 1947:

H. R. 731. An act to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak., and for other purposes.

On April 29, 1947:

H. R. 2404. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

On May 1, 1947:

H. R. 2849. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3020. An act to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to

the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. TAFT, Mr. BALL, Mr. IVES, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. ELLENDER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial from a Wilmington, Del., newspaper.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a signed editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily News by John S. Knight on the subject Curb on Reckless Spending Requires Public Support.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for Monday next, but that being the day set aside for memorial services I ask unanimous consent that I may have this same special order on Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

## PILGRIMAGE FOR GOLD STAR MOTHERS, SISTERS, AND WIVES OF DECEASED SERVICEMEN

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, President Truman recently called for approval of the provisions of the Gold Star pilgrimage bill which I introduced in the House in January 1945 and which I am once again proposing to Congress.

The Hall measure reads as follows:

A bill to provide for pilgrimages of Gold Star mothers, sisters, and wives to the graves of their sons, brothers, and husbands who died in the service of the armed forces of the United States during World War II and who are buried in foreign lands

Be it enacted, etc., That there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for, as soon as possible, and to pay the necessary expenses of, pilgrimages of mothers, sisters, and wives of servicemen who died during World War II

and were buried in foreign lands, to their sons', brothers', and husbands' graves.

Every Gold Star mother, sister, and wife of the recent war should be given the chance to visit the grave of her loved one if it is at all practicable and possible.

The practice of bringing home remains of veterans who fell in battle is now being followed to some extent in accordance with the wishes of the individual family. But most people seem to prefer that graves of the fallen be left unopened. Many would rather the sorrow brought on by death be locked within the mound of earth on that far-off shore instead of renewing its pangs by the return of mortal clay.

It is logical and natural that those nearest and dearest to the deceased should want to make a pilgrimage to the place, however remote, yet hallowed, where he fell fighting for his flag and his country.

After the First World War, several thousand Gold Star Mothers visited their sons' graves in France at Uncle Sam's expense. They set the precedent which ought to be observed at the present. I hope Congress will not hesitate in providing funds and the authority with which to make similar pilgrimages possible in the near future.

I feel sure that all veterans' organizations in America, along with their auxiliaries, will be strongly in favor of the plan as outlined in my bill. The Gold Star mothers, sisters, and wives ought to be considered and included in any mass pilgrimage which finally takes place.

How soon action is to be forthcoming in this regard will depend upon the sincerity of all who give lip service to the relatives of these dead heroes. Let us, then, arouse ourselves to our duty. The Hall bill provides for these pilgrimages of Gold Star mothers and sisters and wives to the graves of their closest ones, who died in service during World War II, and are now buried in foreign lands. There should be no delay in our making such a measure the law of the land.

## LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARTLEY, LANDIS, HOFFMAN, LESINSKI, and BARDEN.

## FOREIGN RELIEF

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House



for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the fact that under House Joint Resolution 134, the so-called foreign relief bill, the United States undertakes relief to Italy and Hungary, while under the proposed peace treaties Italy is to pay Russia \$100,000,000 in war reparations, and Hungary is to pay Russia \$200,000,000 for the same cause, is anomalous and inconsistent to a great many American people. While Italy will not begin payments, as I understand it, until 2 years after the treaty, Hungary is already charged with that obligation, and it was freely said in the hearings that Hungary would not need relief if she did not have to pay reparations.

It seems to me that this difficulty could be obviated if President Truman, in exercise of the powers vested in him by the Lend Lease Act, negotiate with Russia for an assignment of these war damage claims against Hungary and Italy, for which we in return would give her credit on the \$11,000,000,000 she owes us. We could then cancel these obligations against Italy and Hungary, which would do more for European recovery and good will than almost any other thing we could do.

We could even go further and do the same with the \$300,000,000 proposed as war damages to Russia by both Finland and Rumania. In fact, there is no reason why we could not carry this to other countries faced with payment of war reparations to Russia, in each instance giving Russia the credit on her indebtedness to us under lend-lease, and canceling the obligation of the debtor nations. This would, of course, not directly interfere with either House Joint Resolution 134 or the peace treaties.

Russia could not complain, and there is no reason why the President should not undertake negotiations to accomplish what seems to me is one of the biggest steps toward peaceful relations in Europe and world peace.

#### MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR DECEASED MEMBERS

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Memorials, I take this time to advise the Members of the House that all necessary arrangements have been made for the annual memorial services to be held next Monday, May 19. The families of our deceased Members who passed on during the past year have been invited, and many of them, no doubt, will be here. We should make every effort to be here next Monday, just before noon. It is a mark of respect we owe to our deceased colleagues.

The memorial addresses will be delivered by the distinguished gentleman

from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT] will sing two selections during the services. The music will be furnished by the United States Marine Corps orchestra.

#### AID TO KOREA

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, when I came into the Chamber I noticed that one of the Democratic Members of Congress was reading this newspaper carrying the caption "Truman asks \$200,000,000 for Korea" in big headlines. Now, you know that Mr. Truman asked for \$300,000,000 for Greece; Mr. Truman asked for \$100,000,000 for Turkey, and he is asking for millions and millions for various countries of the world. This administration is at home asking Congress to appropriate the great, large gifts. If you pick up the statement issued by the Treasury Department you will notice that on May 9 we were \$275,639,000,000, and many more dollars, in the red. This administration has always been in the red. We have been in the red so long that since the New Deal came into power we have increased our national indebtedness over 1,200 percent. Think of such an increase. Oh, it is terrible. Now you are coming in here with appropriation bills asking the Congress to cut down our home appropriations—and rightfully so. We should cut down these appropriations everywhere we possibly can at home, but how can you cut down your own people when you are asked to give millions and hundreds of millions to every country in the world? It does not make sense. This morning the United States News says that Britain is going to ask for another loan for Great Britain in 1948. Do you fellows not know that you gave Great Britain \$4,400,000,000 last year? That is enough. Now they want another loan in 1948. So, if you give any more money to those fellows to socialize Great Britain, you are just simply nuts. That is all it is. We must economize or bust. We will wreck our country unless we can balance our budget. Think of increasing our debt over 1,200 percent. That is what you have done in 14 years. You were elected to economize—the majority of you. Let us do it. Again, I tell you 10 pennies make a dime and 10 dimes make a dollar. Let us squeeze the eagle and make him holler. Be wise and economize.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the American Bar Association Journal by John R. Nicholson of the Chicago bar entitled "Pensions for Partners: Tax Laws Are Unfair to Lawyers and Firms."

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD and include a report of Policy Committee to members of the Rochester United Nations Association.

#### CONDITIONS AT IWO JIMA

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a letter from a young friend of mine currently stationed on Iwo Jima. At this time when committees of the Congress are considering merger of the armed forces, appropriations therefor, and huge gifts for the relief of destitution, the following excerpts from this young man's letter seem to me to be particularly pertinent:

1. The Air Force is in very bad shape, both as regards equipment and maintenance. Also, it makes a very poor job of running, or trying to run, as a separate unit. It has neither the quantity or quality of personnel to do two jobs—the work of the air corps and the ground forces. It has to call on other branches such as Engineers, Ordnance, Signal Corps, etc.

2. The dependent housing situation is bad. Many officers are leaving the service because they cannot bring their families overseas. It has caused a distinct lowering of morale even among Regular Army. They were promised housing within 3 months and even after 6 months' duty there is no prospect of obtaining it. On a place like this they could have all the houses they need in 1 month. There are literally hundreds of quonsets which require only minor repairs, which could be utilized.

3. The civilians (excluding the teachers) have not been utilized fully or properly. Many of them are having a vacation at a high salary, but it is not their fault. They were sent here as instructors and supervisors of equipment, maintenance, etc., but they are not being used for that purpose. One Diesel mechanic, who lives with me, has not done 2 hours' work in the 2 months he has been here. He wants to work, but there is nothing for him to do.

4. There seems to be some animosity between Air Forces and Ground Forces, between Army and Navy. I hope the merger will allay some of this feeling.

5. The waste of equipment is shocking. Lately, it seems, they are beginning to do something about it, taking inventory and shipping it to China, Korea, etc., but for months very valuable material has lain exposed to the elements and "cannibalized" by scroungers. As a taxpayer, it hurts. \* \* \* My over-all reaction is that somebody had better "get on the ball" and do something to bring the Army to some degree of discipline and efficiency.

#### BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the controlling factor motivating the vote of many on the bill for aid to Greece and Turkey was the fact that the President had announced to the world that we would come to the aid of these countries in the struggle which they faced to pre-

vent being submerged by outside pressures. It was felt that to defeat this measure would be a repudiation, not of the President, but of our own position of world leadership, and that such action would be construed as an indication that we are a divided nation and would furnish an invitation to further aggressive and expansionist tactics.

I, for one, and I know I speak for many of like mind on this side of the aisle, strongly endorse our pursuit of a bipartisan foreign policy. We earnestly desire, in complete good faith, to subordinate partisanship completely over this crucial issue which will determine the entire future of our country and, perhaps, our survival as a Nation and a people.

With the utmost deference and respect, therefore, I call to the President's attention the fact that bipartisanship is a two-way street. Our policy, to be effective, must be bipartisan in its conception, as well as its execution.

Every effort should be made to call on the legislative team of both political parties frequently and sincerely in the formulation of our foreign policy. It is disturbing to have loose talk going about by those in high authority regarding \$5,000,000,000 loans to other foreign countries until such a program has been discussed and approved in substance by at least the leadership of both parties.

This is a warning, issued in the friendliest spirit and the most sincere desire to keep foreign policy on the high level which it has recently enjoyed. The Congress does not wish to be presented with any further fait accompli. If that happens again, the comparatively clear sailing which the Greece-Turkey aid bill enjoyed may not be repeated.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. GARY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial which appeared in the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch on April 28, 1947, entitled "Expensive Penny-Pinching in Washington."

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include editorial comment.

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram he received from Allen Rubottom, manager of the municipal airport at Fort Worth, Tex.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

**OUR AIRPORT PROGRAM MUST BE CARRIED OUT—PROPOSED REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS, IF EFFECTED, WILL RETARD IT**

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a telegram from

the mayor of Chicago and also a telegram from the city council of Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago in the city of Chicago we were fortunate in electing as mayor one of our foremost citizens, a splendid, efficient and experienced businessman, and an economy-minded executive. I refer to Hon. Martin H. Kennelly who succeeded Mayor Edward J. Kelly under whose 14 years of splendid and efficient administration many improvements and betterments were made to our city which time will not permit me to enumerate, yet I cannot resist in calling attention briefly to the construction during Mayor Kelly's regime of many new schools, the demolishing and rehabilitation of many blighted districts upon which many splendid housing projects have been erected, the building of our subway, the construction of one of the country's largest airports, the beautifying and enlargements of our parks, and the widening and construction of over 100 miles of connecting boulevards. It is gratifying that he has been succeeded by a man of the capacity of Mayor Kennelly who, I know, will set an example to the mayors of other cities as to how a municipal government can and should be administered in the interest of its people and taxpayers. Mayor Kennelly was elected by an overwhelming majority of 274,000 votes and this notwithstanding that the Republican National Committee, and the city, county, and State committees, made the municipal election a national issue. I know that he will have the cooperation of all our outstanding businessmen as well as laboring men who have displayed, and justly so, their confidence in him.

Mayor Kennelly will not only follow in the footsteps of such former Democratic mayors as the old and young Carter H. Harrison, each of whom served five terms; Mayor Dunne; Mayor Dever; Mayor Cermak; and Mayor Kelly, in all of whose administrations the people were efficiently served as compared with the administration of former Republican Mayor Thompson, but he has the interest and welfare not only of his city but that of the Nation at heart, as is evidenced by a telegram which he has addressed to me and to other Members from Chicago, wherein he urges sufficient and proper appropriations in carrying out our Federal airport program. The telegram speaks for itself, and I insert it at this point as part of my remarks:

CHICAGO, ILL., May 12, 1947.

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D. C.:

Reference to House Appropriations Committee eliminating all funds for Civil Aeronautics Administration operation of traffic-control towers and reduction in the amount of money to be allotted for building new airports. Control-tower operations is proper function of Government. Such a move would doubtless create improper control conditions throughout the Nation. Reduction of aid in building airports will defeat entire airport program. Amounts now appropriated and authorized are woefully inadequate to effect purpose of Federal Airport Act. Without Government aid increased rather than dimin-

ished, Chicago's Douglas Airport cannot proceed, although it is of vital importance to the continuation of interstate and international traffic and to military operations in case of national emergency.

MARTIN H. KENNELLY,  
Mayor of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to Mayor Kennelly's request for the appropriation of these funds and in the carrying out of the program initiated under the Federal Airport Act and appeal to the fair-minded Members of this House to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], to increase the appropriation for Civil Aeronautics Administration to \$70,982,000.

I have also received a request from the members of the Common Council of the City of Chicago protesting these proposed cuts and a telegram from the chairman of the aviation committee, of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, which I insert as part of my remarks. It reads as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., May 13, 1947.

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
Member of Congress,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Current attempt in H. R. 3311 to curtail appropriations by eliminating from Civil Aeronautics Administration appropriations the Federal operation of airport control towers is believed by our aviation committee to be inadvisable as without such Federal control each city having important airports might otherwise operate arbitrarily with great probability of serious confusion to pilots of scheduled airlines and danger to traveling public at a time when new era of safety can be foreseen through operation of ground control approach system and instrument landing system which also must be under Federal control for obvious reasons. Respectfully submitted,

ERWIN SEAGO,  
Chairman, Aviation Committee, the  
Chicago Association of Commerce  
and Industry.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that these telegrams attest to the vital interest of the people of the Chicago area in this subject legislation and it is my belief that besides these proposed unfair cuts that there are other unjustifiable reductions recommended by the committee which conditions do not warrant. I believe in economy but not a false economy that would jeopardize the lives of thousands of air passengers and I sincerely hope that the amendment of the gentleman from New York will be adopted.

**MAKE SOCIAL SECURITY A FACT AND NOT A FICTION**

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, in the name of humanity and national security, we have spent billions of dollars for the relief of people in other lands while neglecting the needs of our own citizens.

We are withholding assistance from the people who helped to build our Nation and giving it to strangers who may, at some future time, be our enemies.



Such a contradictory policy is beyond understanding. It is hardly calculated to inspire in our people that faith in representative government upon which our national security primarily depends.

Democracy will not survive and develop on words alone. It must prove that it can work for the good of all. In the first quarter of 1947 many business corporations made greater profits than in any other quarter of their history, not excluding the fantastic years of the 1920's.

In that same quarter of 1947 prices rose steadily toward inflationary peaks, while the aged, the blind, and dependent children, who try to exist on fixed payments that were meager to begin with, have seen their few dollars buy less and less. Slowly but surely they are being squeezed toward extinction.

In addition to the billions we have spent abroad for relief, we have hurried through legislation to provide other billions in loans—more properly called gifts—to foreign governments. But when our own dispossessed citizens ask for the relief they are met with a stony silence.

A little more than a year ago the national average payments to 2,047,446 recipients of old-age assistance were only \$39.60 a month; 70,882 needy blind received an average of only \$33.35 a month. Since that time the cost of living has risen rapidly. With controls off, there was a mad scramble for excess profits, and our needy citizens became the first victims. Again there are ominous signs that our Nation is on the roller-coaster of boom-and-bust, yet with the terrible experience of the 1930's still fresh in our minds, we are taking no steps to cushion the shock for those who are least able to bear it.

It should be plain to every mature person in our country that the tremendous productivity of our economy is meaningless unless all of our people have the purchasing power to buy the products of agriculture and industry. We cannot survive half rich and half poor. Let us not forget that the "have and have-not" issue which caused, and is causing, so much trouble for the world can also cause us domestic trouble.

With callous disregard for this emergency, the House Appropriations Committee has lopped off \$77,800,000 from the Labor-Federal Security budget.

Hundreds of thousands of persons over 60 years of age, too young to get present old-age assistance, must become subjects of direct relief. I know many of these oldsters who have given the best years of their lives to their country. The humiliations they are forced to undergo add insult to injury. I say that we have no right to help the people of other lands unless we are prepared at the same time to help our own. Economy has its place in Government, but it must never be at the expense of the needy. Our present social security program is only a beginning. It must go forward and not backward. One of the first amendments to aid its developments must be the lowering of the eligible age to 60, so that American men and women may apply for old-age assistance in time as a right, and not as a charity.

A recession, mild or severe, with a consequent loss of employment to many is

inevitable. We do not want to see our veterans, trying to make a delayed start in life, become its first victims. Far better to retire the old folks who are still working, to make way for the young upon whom the future of our country in the uncertain future immediately ahead depends than to stir up resentment within families.

In the case of those oldsters who are not working, and who will never be hired by industry, the need for reducing the eligible age for assistance to 60 is particularly urgent. Furthermore, there should be no enforced contributions from children. The law must be amended so that those who apply for old-age or blind assistance will be able to stand on their own qualifications. This provision will not prevent children from contributing to their parents' support if they wish to do so on moral grounds. Support-your-relatives or responsible-relatives clause is now invoked in many States, although it is not a Federal requirement. Too often this is used by the States as an excuse to deny aid to a deserving applicant. And where the children are forced to contribute, the cost of the collections greatly exceeds the amount collected. This has caused much misunderstanding and hard feelings among families and has broken up many homes. To show to what extreme such an unworkable law will go, may I quote the experience of Connecticut. In that State, under the responsible-relative clause, it was stipulated that liability rests on a husband or wife, father or mother, grandfather or grandmother, and children or grandchildren. They call this social security.

It is high time that we as a people put first things first and develop a social security system that will give adequate protection to the aged, the blind, and dependent children, lest democracy become a mockery in our own eyes.

The homes of America must be free from want and free from fear.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### JOHN PAUL JONES BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 144) providing for the comprehensive observance of the bicentennial of John Paul Jones.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the John Paul Jones Bicentennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") and to be composed of 15 members, as follows: The President of the United States;

the President pro tempore of the Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; 6 persons to be designated by the President of the United States; 3 Members of the Senate to be designated by the President pro tempore of the Senate; and 3 Members of the House of Representatives to be designated by the Speaker of the House. The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

Sec. 2. The Commission is authorized and directed to arrange for memorial meetings and exercises in the year of 1947 in the city of Washington and other cities and places in the United States particularly associated with the memory of John Paul Jones, and in universities, schools, and colleges throughout the United States.

Sec. 3. (a) The Commission may at its discretion accept from any source, public or private, money or other property to be used for the purpose of making surveys and investigations, formulating, preparing, and considering plans and estimates for the improvement, construction, or other expenses incurred, or to be incurred.

(b) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to employ and fix the compensation of such personnel at it may deem necessary to employ. Such compensation will be made from funds obtained in accordance with section 3 (a).

(c) To the extent deemed by the Commission to be necessary in carrying out its functions, the Commission is authorized to have printing, binding, lithographing, and other work done at establishments other than the Government Printing Office. Compensation for such work will be made from funds obtained in accordance with section 3 (a).

(d) The Commission is authorized to procure advice and assistance from any Government agency, including the services of technical and other personnel in the executive departments and independent establishments, and to procure advice and assistance from and to cooperate with individuals and agencies, public or private. The Superintendent of Documents shall make available to the Commission the facilities of his office for the distribution of portraits, pamphlets, and booklets herein authorized.

Sec. 4. That the Commission shall, at the conclusion of its activities, submit to Congress a comprehensive report of the progress of its work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MEMORIAL TO FIRST INFANTRY DIVISION, WORLD WAR II

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 188) authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces, World War II.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to grant the Memorial Association of the First Infantry Division, United States Army, permis-

sion to erect on public grounds of the United States in the city of Washington, D. C., adjacent to the monument to the dead of the First Infantry Division, American Expeditionary Forces in World War I, a monument to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces in World War II; the site chosen and the design of the monument and pedestal shall be approved by the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library with the advice and recommendations of the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the United States shall be put to no expense in or by the erection of this memorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CANNON'S PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 190) authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That there shall be printed and bound for the use of the House 1,500 copies of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives, by CLARENCE CANNON, to be printed under the supervision of the author and to be distributed to the Members by the Speaker.

SEC. 2. That, notwithstanding any provision of the copyright laws and regulations with respect to publications in the public domain, such revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives shall be subject to copyright by the author thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MEMORIAL TO ANDREW W. MELLON

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 170) authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to grant authority to the Andrew W. Mellon Memorial Committee to erect a memorial fountain on public grounds at the intersection of Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues, in the District of Columbia, such grounds being now owned by the United States: *Provided,* That the design of the

memorial shall be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the United States shall be put to no expense in or by the erection of this memorial: *Provided further,* That unless funds, which in the estimation of the Secretary of the Interior are sufficient to insure the completion of the memorial, are certified available, and the erection of this memorial begun within 5 years from and after date of passage of this joint resolution, the authorization hereby granted is revoked.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN PAUL JONES

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the House passed the joint resolution for the John Paul Jones Bicentennial Commission be vacated, and that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution offered by Messrs. Hulse, Parkman, Burns, Ward, and Powers, of the Senate of the State of California.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD PAY TAXES FOR LAND IT OWNS IN CALIFORNIA—McDONOUGH BILL, H. R. 2030, PROVIDES THIS—46 PERCENT OF CALIFORNIA OWNED BY UNITED STATES

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, many of our States are facing a serious curtailment in tax revenue because of the huge Federal land holdings within their boundaries. The Federal Government has acquired vast acreage that has been set aside as national-forest land, and during the war has expanded its holdings for military and naval bases and for use by the multitude of agencies and enlarged departments which sprang up in the war years.

All of this land is tax-free, and the State and local governments are deprived of the revenue which would be paid on this land if it were under private ownership. At the same time both State and local governments must expend thousands of dollars for the protection of life and property in many of these areas owned by the Government, and must maintain roads and other facilities for the use of people living and working on property owned by the Federal Government.

In the State of California alone, the accumulation of land by the Federal Government has increased in 10 years from 37 percent to 46 percent of all land within the State. Federal acquisition

has extended to 50 percent of all the land in 17 California counties. And in 11 western States, 47 percent of all the land is owned by the Federal Government.

This presents a serious situation since all of this land is tax free. It means that the property owners must pay higher taxes to compensate for the loss of tax revenue on Federal Government-owned lands. It curtails the expenditure for improvements in local communities and in the counties. It deprives the State of legitimate sources of revenue.

I believe it is time that the Federal Government accept its responsibility to compensate the States at least in part for the loss of tax revenue on lands that are owned by the Federal Government. I have introduced H. R. 2030 for this purpose.

My bill would authorize annual payments to the States, Territories and insular governments by the Federal Government based on the fair value of national-forest lands situated therein for the benefit of the local political subdivisions where such lands are situated. Such payment will avert embarrassing fluctuations of income to counties to which stable income is essential to the efficient conduct of local functions of government. It will also remedy inadequacies of contributions to costs of local government in localities where national-forest lands yield little or no revenue.

Legislation such as H. R. 2030 is urgently needed, and I ask the Members of the House to give consideration to this problem during the present session of Congress. The California State Senate has also passed a resolution requesting such action as follows:

#### Senate Resolution 79

Resolution relative to Federal ownership of property within States and local governments

Whereas the problem of the acquisition and ownership of Federal lands in the several States is causing considerable concern because of the reduced evaluation base upon which local property taxes can be levied; and

Whereas such lands are and have been acquired for game reserves, forest reserves, public parks, public monuments, mineral reserves, Federal building for governmental purposes, expanding military facilities, property acquired and used in a proprietary sense, and land remaining in public domain; and

Whereas the accumulation of land for governmental purposes in the heart of metropolitan areas of large cities has substantially reduced the tax base laws used in the determination of the ad valorem tax; and

Whereas the accumulation of land for these several purposes has increased in 10 years from 37 percent to 46 percent of all the lands in California; and

Whereas such accumulation has extended to 50 percent of all the lands in 17 counties of said State; and

Whereas in all the 11 Western States 47 percent of the land is owned by the Federal Government; and

Whereas such large accumulation of land by the Federal Government in California and the other 10 Western States has been destructive to the fiscal structure of local government; and

Whereas the withdrawal of such large amounts of land from taxation has left local government without adequate revenue for its support; and

Whereas this loss of revenue cannot be supplanted by other sources; and



Whereas it is necessary for local government to provide protection of life and property, the maintenance and construction of streets, roads, and highways, and other local facilities to service the properties acquired by the Federal Government and the people living thereon: Therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, as follows:*

1. That the Federal Government assume its financial responsibilities in relation to local governmental jurisdictions where such property is located; that Congress immediately enact legislation to this end;

2. That said legislation provide that local government be reimbursed in amount equivalent to taxes lost by virtue of such acquisition by the Federal Government; or that such property as is owned by the Federal Government be permitted to be taxed locally in the same manner and to the same extent as other local property;

3. That property now held by the Federal Government which is not clearly necessary for a public purpose be disposed of in order that it may be returned to the local tax rolls for the purpose of local taxation and support of local government; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Treasury, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States, and that the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States are respectfully requested to urge such action.

(Resolution read and, on motion of Senator Hulse, adopted.)

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include a series of articles written by Mr. Ralph J. Donaldson of the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

#### BIPARTISAN ACTION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the idea advanced some time ago in the other body by an international statesman that the Congress should consider our foreign policy from a bipartisan standpoint is being extended to cover the domestic situation; that is to say, we are told now that, if the President, or anyone else in authority in the administration, suggests a measure, that we in the Congress ought to go along because if we do not someone in some other country might think we are not united here in America in the defense of our country and do not consider our national welfare. The same thought was advanced when we were considering the Greek-Turkish gift. It was advanced again today by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Now, that argument that the Congress must blindly follow the lead of the President or his advisers or members of his administration is neither sound, logical, nor consistent. The Congress and the Members of Congress have certain responsibilities under the Constitution.

Unless we want to surrender the major part of those responsibilities and duck our obligation to the people who sent us here, there is no reason in the wide world why we should accept every idea that comes out of the White House, which may have been suggested to the President by someone who has something other than the welfare of America in his mind.

There is no reason why we here in the House should follow international statesmen over on the other side of the Capitol when they tell us that we should cut down appropriations, as we are going to do today, which are for the benefit of our own people, and then pour out our money to every country and every people in the world who may ask for it or who can be persuaded, if we suggest it, to come and get it or let us take it to them. Eventually, we cannot protect ourselves if we continue to pour out our money and natural resources to every corner of the world in a vain and hopeless effort to give everyone everything they want or ask. America and her welfare should be our first objectives.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

#### BIPARTISAN ACTION

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a letter signed by 200 people, members of a civic welfare organization in my county at Odin, Ill., in which they would like the Government, which ran out on them on a contract just prior to the war, to go through and help finish the building of a sewer project. I do not know just how I can answer that letter if I tell them that the Government cannot afford to keep its contract when last week we voted \$650,000,000 to go overseas, which presages a few billion more to follow.

As far as this bipartisan policy is concerned, it is a one-way street, and you might just as well know that now. There will be no cooperation, there will be no bipartisan cooperation except as the Republicans take a "me too" attitude and go along. We will find that out when labor legislation and tax legislation go to the President for his signature, and we find it out every day on the floor of the House when an appropriation bill is presented. The sooner the majority party understands that the people expect them to stand on their own two feet and protect the interest of the people of America first, and then deal out our largess afterward, if we can stand it, the better off the country will be and the better off the Republican Party will be.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Republicans will take heed when they hear the words of wisdom uttered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL]. The Republicans are in the majority in this body. Yesterday we were lectured by New Deal members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations because we were not cutting enough; that we promised to cut \$6,000,000,000, and that we had not even scratched the surface. We will be lectured every day about the very same thing. How can we economize when we vote as we did here last week on the Turkish-Greek deal? The parade is on. Remember, Members on the Republican side, you will be asked to vote for universal military training, you will be asked to vote on any number of military bills, you will be scolded by the administration about not looking backward. Remember your campaign pledges of last fall. Remember that we did not promise to spend money all over the world for all kinds of boondoggling projects, but we did promise to balance the budget and cut expenditures.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

#### FASCISM IN ACTION

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] presented a resolution which would, in effect, authorize the printing of some half million booklets entitled "Communism in Action." Congress I think rightly took action on that and authorized the printing of them. It was a research analysis by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Since February 5 there has been a similar resolution in this House regarding Fascism in Action. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has prepared an analogous report on Fascism in Action which, in my opinion, is just as important to the American people as Communism in Action. That particular resolution has been called to the attention of the Committee on Printing. I understand it is before the full committee today. It is my hope that the full committee will act upon this resolution, bring it to the floor of the House, and let the Members pass the resolution authorizing the printing of this research analysis on Fascism in Action in America.

I refer to an editorial in today's Post entitled "Let the Chips Fall."

We as American citizens are just as much opposed to fascism as to communism.

The editorial reads as follows:

#### LET THE CHIPS FALL

Today the House Appropriations Committee is scheduled to come to grips with fascism. The issue is House Resolution 83, sponsored

by Representative PATMAN, which calls for publication of a pamphlet, *Fascism in Action*, prepared for him by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. This booklet ought to be circulated as the counterpart of *Communism in Action*, prepared some time ago for Congressman DIRKSEN. Nearly a million copies of the Dirksen publication already have been printed. A clear precedent is thus established. We hope that the House committee will grasp its responsibility for bringing to the attention of Americans the workings of a force equally as sinister as communism. They are faces of the same repugnant medal.

In this respect the record of the Subcommittee on Printing, which handled the resolution after Mr. PATMAN introduced it February 5, has been anything but encouraging. At first the subcommittee bottled up the resolution. Then, after repeated inquiry, it reported the measure out to the full committee without recommendation. This was, indeed, a strange reaction on the part of men supposedly dedicated to oppose all forms of totalitarianism. If the resolution is allowed to stagnate, Congress will be placed in an exceedingly unfortunate light. It will have, in effect, given its blessing to an anti-Communist crusade while at the same time remaining oblivious to a force no less dangerous to our way of life.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the editorial in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—PORTAL-TO-PORTAL PAY BILL SIGNED (H. DOC. NO. 247)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I have today signed H. R. 2157, the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947. The primary purpose of this act is to relieve employers and the Government from potential liability for billions of dollars in so-called portal-to-portal claims. These claims have emerged since judicial interpretation of the wage-and-hour law raised the possibility that employers might be required to pay back wages for certain activities which in most industries had not previously been considered by either workers or employers to be compensable. I believe that, in the interest of the economic stability of our Nation, it is essential to clarify this matter by statute.

The Portal-to-Portal Act should end this uncertainty with respect to claims of still undetermined magnitude. Current wage negotiations can proceed more readily to a satisfactory conclusion, and businessmen will be able to plan with assurance for full production and price reductions. This will be of real value to labor and management in the maintenance of a continued high level of employment.

I am confident that the purpose of the main provisions of the act is to eliminate the immense potential liabilities which have arisen as the result of the portal-

to-portal claims. It is not the purpose of the act to permit violation of our fundamental wage-and-hour standards, or to allow a lowering of these standards. This is evident from the findings of the Congress set forth in section 1 of the act as to the need for legislation.

Some doubts have been expressed to me, however, concerning the effects of this legislation upon our wage and hour standards.

Section 2 of the act relates to existing claims. From my consideration of this section, I understand it to be the intent of the Congress to meet the problem raised by portal-to-portal claims, but not to invalidate all other existing claims. The plain language of section 2 of the act preserves minimum wage and overtime compensation claims based upon activities which were compensable in any amount under contract, custom, or practice. Various provisions of the act such as sections 3, 9, and 12, would be rendered absurd or unnecessary under any other interpretation. Moreover, a contrary interpretation would raise difficult and grave questions of constitutionality.

As to section 4, relating to future claims, the legislative history of the act shows that the Congress intends that the words "principal activities" are to be construed liberally to include any work of consequence performed for the employer, no matter when the work is performed. We should not lose sight of the important requirement under the act that all principal activities must be paid for, regardless of contract, custom, or practice. I am sure the courts will not permit employers to use artificial devices such as the shifting of work to the beginning or the end of the day to avoid liability under the law.

I wish also to refer to the so-called good faith provisions of sections 9 and 10 of the act. It has been said that they make each employer his own judge of whether or not he has been guilty of a violation. It seems to me that this view fails to take into account the safeguards which are contained in these sections. The employer must meet an objective test of actual conformity with an administrative ruling or policy. If the employer avails himself of the defense under these sections, he must bear the burden of proof. He must show that there was affirmative action by an administrative agency and that he relied upon and conformed with such action. He must show further that he acted in good faith in relying upon that administrative action.

Section 11 of the act gives the court discretionary authority to waive liquidated damages. Under the language of the section, however, it continues to be the duty of the court to award liquidated damages unless convinced that the employer has, in good faith, sought to comply with his obligations under the act. I do not believe this section will be used to permit employers to engage in violation of the law with impunity.

I am aware that this act introduces new and possibly ambiguous language, the effects of which can be accurately measured only after interpretation by the courts. I have therefore instructed the Secretary of Labor to keep me cur-

rently informed as to the effects of this act upon the preservation of wage-and-hour standards. If those effects prove to be detrimental to the maintenance of fair labor standards for our workers, I shall request the Congress to take prompt remedial action.

The enactment of H. R. 2157 makes necessary additional appropriations for the administration and enforcement of the wage-and-hour laws. The 2-year statute of limitations under this act will in most cases substantially reduce the period of time within which workers' claims may be asserted under the wage-and-hour laws. It will be necessary, therefore, to augment the Government's program of inspection and enforcement in order to detect violations early enough to protect workers from undue losses. Other provisions of the act also place additional responsibilities upon the Department of Labor. I shall submit estimates to the Congress for the necessary appropriations.

Prior to its adjournment last year, the Congress had reached a large measure of agreement as to legislation to increase minimum-wage standards. I trust that with the passage of the Portal-to-Portal Act, relieving the business community of a heavy burden of doubt, the Congress will now turn to a reexamination of minimum-wage standards.

In enacting the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, the Congress declared it to be our national policy to eliminate labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers. It has become increasingly evident that the minimum wage of 40 cents an hour established by that act is far from adequate to meet that national policy. I am convinced that immediate amendment of the act to provide a minimum of at least 65 cents an hour is necessary. In addition, minimum-wage benefits should be extended to many persons not now protected by the law, as I have recommended in previous messages to the Congress.

I recommend that the Congress take action upon these matters now.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 14, 1947.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on soil conservation appearing in the New York Times.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 57]

Allen, Ill.	Bell	Boykin
Andresen,	Bennett, Mo.	Buckley
August H.	Bland	Buffett
Auchincloss	Bloom	Bulwinkle
Bates, Ky.	Boggs, La.	Butler



Byrne, N. Y.	Fuller	Miller, Nebr.
Clements	Gifford	Morrison
Clippinger	Gregory	Nodar
Coffin	Harless, Ariz.	Patman
Cooley	Hays	Pfeifer
Cox	Hendricks	Powell
D'Alesandro	Jones, N. C.	Rayfield
Davis, Tenn.	Kearns	Sarbacher
Dawson, Ill.	Kefauver	Taylor
Dawson, Utah	Kelley	Thomas, N. J.
Dirksen	Keogh	Thomas, Tex.
Dondero	Kerr	Vinson
Doughton	Lemke	Vorss
Ellis	Lyle	Wadsworth
Fellows	McDowell	West
Fernandez	McGarvey	
Flannagan	Mansfield, Tex.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 366 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

# STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3311, with Mr. CURTIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] on yesterday in an eloquent and powerful manner gave to the House and to the Congress convincing reasons why our short-wave broadcasts abroad, known as the Voice of America, should be continued. As a part of its strategy in making ideological advancement in taking country after country over, an important part of the Soviet Union's war of nerves is in intense radio propaganda. While exact figures are not available, sufficient information is available for our officials and for us to know that Russia is spending for this purpose several times what we are spending, and other countries, recognizing the value of this type of activity, are spending more than we do. It is a well-known fact that adherence, even a limited adherence, to the truth in its propaganda activities is not one of the elements of the Soviet Union's policy. It is also a well-known fact that an intensive drive is being made everywhere possible to place the United States in a false light. Japan, China, Asia, and elsewhere in the Far East did the same thing before and during the recent war.

In the light of world conditions, in the light of the false propaganda being directed at us, it seems to me to be a wise investment to present America in its proper light and to expose the falsity

of propaganda the purpose of which is to undermine our prestige elsewhere and to create doubt, uncertainty, and disbelief in the minds of people elsewhere that there is any future for them except through the road of communism. A powerful weapon of Hitler in the technique of the war the Nazis had developed in its first and open stage was propaganda of all kinds, prominent among which was the radio that brought division among the intended victims through fear and uncertainty, the appeal to all kinds of emotionalism, principally fear and hatred.

The same technique is being used now, except instead of the actual attack by the Soviet Union following when a people are weakened and divided from within, the Communist group within a country takes over, and then the real viciousness starts into operation.

The false and vicious types of radio propaganda being given to the peoples of other countries against our country should, and must, be met.

In the Middle East, for example, I have been informed that Russian broadcasts accuse the United States of having diplomatic agents over there to gobble up all oil deposits. They cite in support the fact that we have oil attachés at our embassies and legations, and from this fact alone, being termed "oil attachés"—their title—that we have hundreds of them over there for the purpose of stealing the oil fields of the Middle East. Built up, as they cleverly do, the Russian radio—although it is false except as to the title—and I have been informed that we have only six or seven such attachés—makes out a case that appeals emotionally, and the reaction, as intended, is to create fear and hatred of the United States.

This is an illustration of how the truth is completely distorted. I have suggested to the State Department that the titles of these attachés be changed as an effective means of meeting this false propaganda.

Every kind of deception or falsehood is resorted to—that which they think will assist in producing the desired results—fear and hatred of the United States or Great Britain—and when concentrating their efforts on a particular country, sending out propaganda that will confuse and divide a people, and to further the aims and objectives of the Russian or Communist Party within a country—thereby spreading as far and as rapidly as possible communism internationally, resulting in a more powerful and dangerous Soviet Union internally, and more dangerous as a world power and a world threat.

Their broadcasts on the Moscow Conference is a distortion of the truth. The United States is pictured to unfortunate and starving and distressed persons of other countries—already subjected to fear—as a country that is responsible for their condition in some places, and in other places as a greedy and selfish imperialistic nation.

The blame is placed on the United States principally, and also Great Britain—and France will probably now be included—for the unfortunate conditions that exist elsewhere, for the failure of

peace, and being clever propagandists, the Russians portray a discolored picture and a distorted argument that is productive of the results they desire.

The fact that the Soviet Union is responsible for the negative Moscow Conference results is well known to us, but there are many countries in which only the Russian distortion of the story of the Conference is known.

We know that the failure is due to Russia's refusal to cooperate with understanding. Secretary Marshall, in substance, told the world that after his return, but great parts of the world were unable to get his report. In his report Secretary Marshall told us that the Soviet Union—and I quote from the New York Times editorial of April 29—"made agreements impossible by insisting on conditions in both Austria and Germany which made inevitable not only a further drain on American resources, but also a continuous economic deterioration in all Europe, leading to new dictatorships and new strife."

The editorial—and I quote from it again because I agree with it—further says: "And though Mr. Marshall refrained from saying so, it is no secret that it is in such a situation that the Communists put their hope for further expansion."

Under these conditions, in the light of the intense and false propaganda over the radio, what are we going to do? What should we do?

Without discussing the value of the frequency we will lose, it is my opinion that it would be unwise to terminate this activity completely.

The views of Secretary Marshall in the matter have been strongly expressed. It seems to me that his views are worthy of deep consideration. Next to the President, Secretary Marshall is charged with the duty and responsibility of steering our ship of State. He has a duty and responsibility of a primary nature. Unless substantial progress is made toward a real peace settlement at the next meeting of the Big Four foreign ministers which is scheduled for next November, I cannot see where any good can come of further efforts. As I interpret world conditions and world events, the deadline or time limit is the next meeting of the Big Four foreign ministers. In the meantime, contrary to the recommendations, in fact, the urgings of Secretary Marshall, should we completely discontinue this activity?

We are also aware that private industry cannot properly carry on this activity, particularly outside the Western Hemisphere. The evidence from leading figures in the radio field is evident in this respect.

You will note I have confined my remarks to the basic question of the continuance of this activity. While I have opinions which in part agree and in part do not agree with the criticisms of personnel and type of broadcast, I refrain from entering into them because they can be corrected if funds are appropriated to continue the broadcasts. I agree that with the continuance the best brains in this country in this specialized field should be obtained, even if some have to respond and do so at a sacrifice

to themselves as they did during the war, in order that the maximum results for our country may be obtained. While World War II is over, peace does not prevail, and the peace is not won. Those in the radio field in whom everyone has confidence should, if necessary, respond to bring to this activity the maximum of success. I am sure they will gladly give their country of their brains and their time in the months ahead, and particularly between now and next November, as they so willingly did during the war period.

My remarks today are addressed to the basic question of the immediate necessity for continuing these broadcasts. I have hopes that this will be done in the House. In a sense it is still not too late. However, if it is not done in this body, I hope it will be done in the other branch, and that the conference committee will see that the funds the Senate makes available are finally appropriated to assure the continuance of this important and necessary type of broadcast.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we should approach this problem knowing what we are doing and realizing what we are doing. We should approach this problem with the idea that if the Voice of America is to be continued it shall be the voice of America, and not something that will discredit and destroy America and the good will of other countries toward us.

The trouble with me is that I like to know what I am doing. Would to God that that idea would spread. Every time this broadcasting business has been up I have done something that I do not believe anyone else in the Congress has done: I have asked for copies of the broadcasts and I have read them. I know something about them. I am not so sure but that something must be done some time, and some time soon, with reference to these broadcasts; but for one solid year and a half the same management has been in charge of that operation, and there has been no accomplishment of putting the thing on a sound business basis where it was pulling ahead.

These broadcasts which I shall refer to are of recent origin, coming within the last few weeks, and I do wish some of those who are advocating this would come into my office and read these broadcasts.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Why is it not possible to print a copy of the broadcasts in the Record so that we can all see them? Why are they so secret? What is so secret about these broadcasts?

Mr. TABER. There is nothing secret about them. The only question is as to the volume of them. To print those broadcasts in the Record would make a Record 40 times the volume of the regular daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the lot of broadcasts that I have in my office.

Let me give you an illustration of what is involved. There are 15-minute broadcasts to foreign countries upon the life and character of Carrie Chapman Catt,

an estimable woman who died within the last several months, but concerning whom the rest of the world would have very little idea and the present generation of Americans would also have very little idea.

Let me read to you one of the broadcasts to Russia:

The hero of today's Herald Tribune report has found a brilliant solution of his problem. On Long Island, in New York State, there are a number of abandoned railroad branch lines. Our bright veteran has surveyed the available plots and found himself a cozy railroad station built of red bricks. He then contacted the railroad authorities and leased the empty building for a song. Within a short time the abandoned station was transformed into a cozy house, consisting of a bedroom, living room, kitchen, and bath. The house is equipped with electricity, steam heat, radio, a kitchen range, electric refrigerator, and all other modern living equipment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Here is another line. They broadcast a number of book reviews covering a long period of time. Amongst the books was a book about the city of Denver. They tell how they used to shoot each other on sight and about the fellow who built an opera house there and the architect put Shakespeare's picture in the lobby. The man who had had the theater built, a silver tycoon, came in and ordered Shakespeare's picture taken out of the lobby and had his picture placed in the lobby instead.

Then there was another book on the anthology of American cities, by Robert S. Allen, telling how corrupt those cities were. There was a broadcast of that. Both of those things were designed deliberately to hold America up to ridicule. When an outfit does not know any better than to do those things, it is time we began to wake up and to get things straightened out. What I demand and what I believe must be done, if we are going to have a Voice of America, is that those things be cleaned up and that we have an outfit that is pulling for America and not trying to make us perfectly ridiculous and asinine.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman in mentioning book reviews that have been given over this Voice of America broadcast, has evidently failed to mention the most famous of all reviews, the review of the book on the Wallace family, in which Mr. Henry Wallace was held out as the great American of all times, and the broadcast was made at the very moment he was in Europe attempting to sabotage the President's so-called foreign policy program.

Mr. TABER. That is correct, and it is pitiful. The only way we are going to get that thing cleaned up is to have it cleaned up before we make appropriations. I called this to the attention of

the head of the State Department immediately after he was appointed. If we are going to have a Voice of America, let me suggest something. Amongst the best of our broadcasters today are Lowell Thomas and Fulton Lewis, Jr. They have probably as much range as any two broadcasters. There may be others. I am not trying to freeze anybody out. But those two men have staffs of six or seven. Four or five people with their proper staffs could take care of the broadcasting that needs to be done, with translators and people who would have to broadcast in those languages. Cut out the kind of thing that is just pusillanimous and silly.

I want to see a decent job done wherever we have a job to do. I want to see an end to those in the Department, who have no business being in charge of this kind of thing, and have them taken off the Federal pay roll, and the Federal pay roll carry only a set-up that may be necessary to do a decent job.

I hope the House will take an American position on this thing and not a position designed to destroy America, and not propose to continue something that is not being done right.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it not a fact that this Voice of America broadcast has more than four times as many, or over 1,500 employees in New York—more than four times as many as any of the American networks have employed in New York City?

Mr. TABER. More than that. They have a whale of a force in Washington.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But over 1,500 in New York?

Mr. TABER. Yes, and \$6,500,000 pay roll right here in Washington alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with considerable interest to the statements of both the minority whip [Mr. McCormack] and the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee [Mr. TABER]. I would like to make sure that all of the members of this committee understand another aspect of this problem which has not been discussed or explored thus far in the debate.

It happens that I am now serving as Chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs which is holding hearings on a bill providing for a United States Information Service which includes this Voice of America program. It is H. R. 3342, which I introduced a week or so ago.



Our hearings have now been under way for several sessions.

The report of the Appropriations Committee raises three questions about this particular program. The first is that it is not authorized by law. With that I can find no quarrel. I recognize that a point of order can be raised against this appropriation at this time. I anticipate that such a point of order will be raised because there is obviously enough opposition to the program so that any individual Member of the House can insist that it be authorized by law before it becomes a governmental practice.

Let me say frankly that with that position I have no quarrel. I am one of those who for a long time has felt that the function of the Appropriations Committee is to act as the fiscal committee of this House, to appropriate money to finance projects which have been authorized by legislation. I am glad that this somewhat belated, but I hope firm, attitude of the Appropriations Committee of the House has been announced. I hope it will become precedent. I hope that the Appropriations Committee will not write legislation into appropriation bills at this time or any other time because I think the integrity of the legislative committees of the House should be sustained.

So if the action on this appropriation is the forerunner of a firm and permanent and consistent program certainly I find no quarrel with this attitude of the Appropriations Committee which says simply that from now on they are not going to appropriate money for any purpose which has not been authorized by legislative action and which says that the legislative committees of the House are going to be protected in their position as legislative committees. Members of Congress generally will applaud this decision by the Appropriations Committee. We shall expect it to become a prevailing rule in the future and not simply be used as an isolated device for denying money for Voice of America broadcasts.

The second protest raised against this bill, however, deals with the heart of the program. It says that the Government should not be in the news business. That sounds perfectly reasonable to disciples of the free enterprise system such as we all are in this House. However, the stubborn fact remains that since the war we are appropriating or have appropriated between ten and twenty billion dollars for a reconstruction job to be done in the occupied areas in the world which we have recently defeated, or to be used in other sections of the world where we are interesting ourselves to the extent of granting funds or giving materials or lending money. It is nothing more than good, canny Yankee business judgment to spend a small fraction of 1 percent of that amount to advertise abroad the objectives we seek with those many billions.

This matter of telling the true American story abroad is a job it seems to me that everybody agrees must be done, and I think the chairman of the Appropriations Committee is on record saying that he too believes that job must be done. We must help the rest of the world un-

derstand the purpose for which we are spending these billions of dollars. We must make certain that this burden upon the American taxpayer is not entirely a gesture of futility. Unless our purposes are understood abroad it is apt to become just a gesture of futility. It is imperative that we accompany these vast expenditures with a program of information and edification which will help them to procure and protect the peace.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I think it is not only necessary that the world know why we are appropriating this money but also that it would help a great deal if we ourselves knew why we are appropriating the money.

Mr. MUNDT. I think that is correct.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I read with interest the gentleman's bill and wish to ask him whether in connection with what we are discussing today it would not be possible to include in the bill provisions to prevent these broadcasters from defaming America and conducting themselves in un-American ways.

Mr. MUNDT. I am coming to that aspect a little later in my remarks. It certainly is possible. My bill stipulates such safeguards specifically.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly apparent the gentleman will not have sufficient time to present his statement. I ask unanimous consent that his time may be extended for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you, Mr. McCORMACK. Let us now get down to the problem we face. Here is a job of publicity for the American program which we all recognize must be done. Unfortunately, the private information sources in this country are unable to do it. They themselves have come before Congress and before governmental agencies saying they cannot provide the types of service in the areas of the world which require them. At this time there are 7 licensees of short-wave broadcasting in this country and they all say they are utterly unable as a commercial venture of their own to provide the programs required in various portions of the earth.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman's statement is entirely true, that they cannot afford through commercial support alone to furnish these broadcasts. Is it not also true that the privately owned broadcasting companies of this country that have short-wave radio facilities can furnish this service, can furnish information for the State Department and for the other governmental

departments, to foreign lands at a much lower cost than has been the case under the present program?

Mr. MUNDT. They cannot do it without financial assistance from the outside.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I say at a lower cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. MUNDT. Perhaps a better bargain can be driven through the terms of a new contract; however, the Federal Government contracts with these licensees and 50 percent of the programs are arranged by them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. These contracts with the licensees are for the use of the physical facilities only. Cannot these same licensees furnish the programs under direction of the Government at much less cost than at the present time?

Mr. MUNDT. Fifty percent of the programs themselves are arranged by private licensees.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman mean to say that 1,500 employees of the State Department in New York are only doing half of the work of this broadcasting arrangement that we now have, and that these six or seven hundred in Washington are only doing a part of the work, that half of the service is being furnished by private industry?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is correct. Half of the information and half of the programs are being furnished by private interests.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it not a fact that these employees to which the gentleman refers are not only engaged in broadcasting but they are engaged in various other methods of disseminating the facts about America, such as moving pictures and the other activities of the department?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is absolutely correct and to that should be added that they are also engaged in monitoring the broadcasts which Foreign Governments are sending out and which all too frequently are devoted to distorting and perverting our American principles and purposes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman believe that these broadcasts, the art and the material that has been furnished by this "Voice of America" and by this division of the State Department are directly representative of the American life and the American way of doing things?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman believes that the broadcasts and the other informational services are rendering great support to the American concept abroad. The gentleman speaking is not willing to defend every single individual broadcast, nor the "Circus Lady" nor the Wallace book. I recognize mistakes have been made and, if I may be permitted to proceed, I will explain why under the basic legislation which I have introduced those types of mistakes will be less frequent.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I ask that the gentleman explain to the House if he believes the people who are doing this work are all good Americans?

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman will give me time, I will enter into that question also. If they are not, however, my bill, H. R. 3342, contains a section which will definitely and completely correct that situation.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I understood that private broadcasting companies, in connection with Harvard University and certain other universities, were presently carrying on a program.

Mr. MUNDT. One of the seven licensees is a foundation, which includes the broadcasting of programs sponsored in part by Harvard University.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I am happy to know that the gentleman's subcommittee is considering this matter, because, as he says, it is vitally important. It is also vitally important that we recognize what private resources are doing in the direction of our foreign relations. It was brought out in a conference at which the gentleman was present, that World-Wide Radio was broadcasting in Greek on their own three times a week, but the State Department only admitted that after we questioned them in detail. We want the whole truth. It is true, of course, that they conduct some moving-picture exercises; however, the moving-picture industry itself is spending today \$2,000,000 of their own money in the field of foreign relations. Those things should be brought to the attention of the American people. We have had no success at all in getting the State Department to admit that anybody else but themselves were in this field. The American people are entitled to the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I see no point in discussing a matter that is in this bill which we are going to go into at some length when an amendment is offered to restore the item. I wonder if, for the reason of conserving time, we could not discuss and debate these matters when we come to them at that point in the bill. However, I shall not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you all, sincerely, for your forbearance. I shall not yield at the moment because I want to continue with the points which I was endeavoring to make, and in another 5 minutes I shall conclude.

The second point is that we have asked that to be done which private industry, unaided, cannot do; there is no question about this fact.

The third point is the controversial one. The Appropriations Subcommittee says, with some accuracy in its report, that this program has not been efficiently administered. Certainly, it has made some very serious mistakes. It has done some things which I might even call blunders. But I call to the attention of the committee that this is a new venture; that it is an entirely new experience for the American Government in peacetime to present to areas of the world, with many, many different languages, broadcasts which are going to have the right kind of receptivity and the right kind of result in these countries.

Among the people now administering the program there is real honest controversy as to whether this program, for example, should be sort of a showcase for America, such as you have in front of a big department store, in which you place the items which you have for sale, but in which you place only your best items, the ones of which you are proud, the ones you think will have the biggest appeal to the passers-by. There is one line of argument holding that these broadcasts should be devoted exclusively to that kind of program. They insist with considerable persuasiveness that this information program should be in fact what I would call a showcase for America abroad.

There is also a valid argument that can be presented that these broadcasts should not be a showcase for America, but that, rather, they should be a mirror of America; that they should reflect what happens here; imaging abroad some of the bad things as well as some of the good things.

The Secretary of State leans in the direction of supporting those who believe that we should make these broadcasts a mirror of America. Secretary Marshall says these broadcasts should employ what he has so aptly called "the strategy of truth." Mr. Marshall stresses that you have to develop on the part of the listeners a respect for the objectivity of the programs; a respect for the fact that they do mix the bitter with the sweet.

I am not prepared to say whether this information service abroad should be a show case or a mirror for America. I am prepared to say however, that as this bill is developed during the hearings and through amendments, and as it is then screened through the Committee on Appropriations for the purpose of securing money for the services we authorize, Congress can write in the precautions which make it possible for us to voice our will as to whether this program should give only the sunshiney, polyanic, happy side of America or whether it should present both sides of the picture. In my opinion America is great enough and good enough so that even if our foreign broadcasts are just an honest mirror of what America is and how Americans live we will continue to develop and increase respect for the United States abroad.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman said a minute ago that he thought we should give both the good and the bad side.

Mr. MUNDT. I said I was not prepared to say, because there is great argument among those administering the program whether the program should be used as a show case or a mirror of American life. Whichever idea is used, however, I favor keeping the voice of America articulate abroad.

Mr. JENSEN. Can the gentleman tell me just when the new concept of salesmanship took place? I always thought that when a salesman went out to sell his goods, he told about the good things about his goods; he did not tell of the bad things. Now, if we are going to embark on a program to tell the world about the bad things of America, I think we are going far astray from the purposes of these broadcasts.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the gentleman has been approached by too many of those blue-sky stock salesmen who prey upon the rich farmers of Iowa, and who certainly give only the bright side of a picture. A good salesman these days does present an honest picture and does not try to sell his product as Utopia.

Mr. JENSEN. That is just talk. I am getting down to brass tacks. I am not floating around in mid-air here and saying a lot of words for nothing. I am trying to find out from the gentleman if it is necessary to spend millions and millions of dollars on this Voice of America to tell the people of the world of a lot of bad things that may be going on here. I do not think that is a good policy. The gentleman is putting himself in the role of a salesman now, he is trying to sell us right now on the idea that this is a good thing to keep up. We know there are a lot of bad things in it, but if we did not know it, would the gentleman as a salesman trying to sell this job to us tell us about all the bad things?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. In fact, the burden of my speech has been to present the facts and to point out that this program is not above reproach; it is not above criticism. We are now holding hearings before my subcommittee on my bill for making this the proper type of program so that we can do what the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] says we should do, have the Voice of America articulated in such fashion that it is clearly and convincingly a real American voice.

Mr. Chairman, may I call attention to title IX, section 901 of my proposed legislation, H. R. 3342, as it is designed directly to eliminate some of the causes for most of the criticism which has been made against this idea to set up a permanent and continuing United States Information Service abroad.

Here is the language of that section:

No individual may be employed or assigned to duties under this act unless the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after such investigation as he deems necessary, certifies that, in his opinion, such individual is loyal to the United States and such employment or assignment is consistent with the security of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, that provision assures us all that real, sturdy, Americans—proud of the American concept and eager to protect, preserve, and promote it—will administer and staff this information program. We can be positive under



that provision that no Communists, or parlor pinks, or crypto-communists, or fellow travellers will have any part in this program in any way, shape, or form. That provision should permit us to consider the program on its merit without fear that it will be sabotaged by disloyal or apologetic Americans. That provision makes certain we will have as complete a house cleaning as is necessary and is warranted. It does precisely what the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. TABER] has been suggesting. It sets up safeguards for the staffing of this program which are unequaled in almost any other legislation ever passed by Congress—they are as complete, in fact, as those which made certain of the loyalty of the men working on the so-called Manhattan project, the atomic-bomb project, during the days of war.

Colleagues, if the Voice of America has had a faulty lip at times or a foreign accent, let us not cut the throat of the Voice of America to correct either its diction or direction. Let us rather guide it by congressional mandate and supervision to make certain it develops the sturdy American twang which we all desire it to demonstrate. All of you are invited to bring your ideas and suggestions before my subcommittee which is meeting daily. Any amendments you propose will be most carefully considered. It is our hope to bring this legislation before you at an early date and in such form that its safeguards and provisions will assure you all that this enabling legislation for an American information program abroad merits your approval so that new finances may be provided for it before the ending of the current fiscal year next July 1.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a certain degree of apprehension and bewilderment to what I have just heard. Just what are we trying to do? Are we undertaking to convince the world that we are crazy? If we are, this is a fine program. We propose now to take how many million dollars to do this thing? If it were \$5 it would be too much.

Are there those in this body who are apprehensive that the libelers and the slanderers who are undertaking to whistle this country down the wind will not tell enough lies to make the people of foreign countries think we are as bad as they want the world to think we are? Who is it among this motely crew who has sense enough to mirror the people of this country to the world as we really are? I have seen some of this stuff they have been putting out. The representatives of the State Department say they want the people of foreign countries to know what American women look like, and they get up a caricature, a squat creature of the muck and mire and hold this misshapen thing up to the world as an American circus performer taking a rest.

We have Henry Wallace. He has been on the loose. He is not costing the taxpayers of the country anything now. He has been to Europe and has misrepresented this country pretty thoroughly. He said we have a malicious purpose to police the borders of Russia in order to

impose American imperialism upon the Russians. I noticed in yesterday's paper that Henry said the time has now come in this country for the Federal Government to nationalize the coal mines.

If it were not that some of the inmates are violent, we could empty our lunatic asylums and put the lunatics on the air. I just cannot bring myself to vote any money to finance a fool program like this.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. After reading what Wallace said in Europe and hearing of the broadcast boosting him at the time he was over there, I thought of the Irishman who came back after the First World War and said he found the French so darned ignorant he could hardly make them understand their own language. I am afraid Mr. Wallace had quite a good deal of trouble explaining communism to the Communists of Europe.

Mr. JENNINGS. Generally speaking, when someone is not using him to broadcast a record full of his malevolence he is as clear as mud on any subject to which he addresses himself. We just do not have competent people to carry on a program like this. If we have them, the State Department has failed to employ such persons. If the people of Europe, in spite of the billions of dollars that we have showered upon them—if the people of Europe after having been snatched as a brand from the burning—if the people all over Europe do not know that we are the kindest, most generous, and most sympathetic people on the face of the earth, no amount of silly broadcasting will enable them to realize these facts.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Referring to the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota that he thinks we ought to sell the good as well as the bad, I understand that in this same program, before Mr. Wallace made his trip over there, the State Department used a great deal of money that we had appropriated to sell the countries of Europe on the merits of Henry Wallace, and most Republicans ought to know this—they used part of the money to sell the whole world and this country especially on the evils of the Republican Party.

Mr. JENNINGS. I never knew whether Mr. Truman sent boomerang-throwing Henry Wallace up in a trial balloon and forced him to jump out without a parachute, or whether Henry did it while running true to form on his own.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, let me point out just one other thing about selling America. I have been trying law-

suits for a long time. If any lawyer should go into court and try a case with the purpose of showing the weak points of his client's case instead of leaving that to his adversary, such a lawyer should be bored for the simples. No man need ever worry that his adversary and his enemies will not point out his weak points. The thing to do if you have a cause that you wish to sell is to put your best foot forward.

What is wrong with this country anyhow? If these people do not know that this is the one free Republic in all the world, if they do not know that this is perhaps the only solvent country in the world, if after we have paved the road of victory to Berlin and Tokyo with the dead and broken bodies of more than a million of our finest, our bravest, our strongest and best men, if they do not know these facts there is nothing in the world that will convince them of what the people of this country have done for them.

Let us keep this money and, if necessary, use it to feed the hungry and clothe the naked.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words and ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, there is much that I lack in many ways so far as education and training is concerned. For instance, I have not been highly educated in art, but I am sure that we do have in the Congress many Members who are well trained in the arts and sciences and who have studied, with a great deal of care, during the last few weeks some of the material that is being sent out by our Government, at the expense of the American taxpayers, to give to the people of the world a true picture of American life so that they may know something about America; so that they may have some idea of what representative government stands for; so that they may learn what real liberty and true freedom actually mean.

In order that those of you who, like myself, have not had the opportunity to study art at home or in foreign lands may become better informed, I am going to take the liberty of passing around among you some of the pictures we are now spending good money to send abroad. I hope you will be kind enough to return them to the table. I hope that on your own time, and at the proper time, you will be kind enough to give to the House the benefit of your deductions and your understanding of just what these pictures represent in American life.

This picture, I think, represents sleepy-eyed potatoes in the springtime. Here is a very fine illustration. I am sure that from it some of you may now be able to understand what a great contribution we are making to peace abroad. I would like especially to have the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] explain just exactly what this picture represents.

Here is one that has a colonial hat placed jauntily upon a skeleton. I am

sure the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] can explain its meaning in his own time. I am certain he will be interested in it.

I have quite a number of other pictures if anyone wants to see them. Anyone who ever lived along the seashore would recognize this picture, either as a fish or the Wreck of the Hesperus. You may make your own decision.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Have you some that you can show the ladies?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, yes. I have some that I can show the ladies. I will ask the lady if she ever saw another lady with the physical characteristics that this particular picture portrays? Is it representative of our American womanhood? I pray not.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I never saw her pose for a picture.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is what is known in the newspaper business as leg art, in case the lady is interested.

Here is a very, very symbolic picture. I am not sure just what it is, but I am certain the Members would like to look at it.

Here is a picture of a maze that I am sure all of you can find your way out of, if you will look at it carefully and study it. Is it truly representative of American life?

Here is another beautiful picture I think you may all enjoy. It is a remarkable conception of what our Republic stands for, and here is a picture which I believe should be entitled "Congress at Work."

This is a hunting scene that I am sure is typical of some of the work of our aboriginal ancestors here in America.

Here is another picture I am sure you can understand. Of course, there is no congressional mind that cannot grasp the full significance of this picture. I would like for the gentleman from California to study it. If he wishes he can interpret it for us. Perhaps he can give us some idea of what it really means.

Of course, everyone recognizes this picture. This is the Washington trolley system that we have here in our Capital city. It is typical.

I am sure the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], will be interested in this particular picture. Perhaps he can explain it to his constituents when he gets home.

Here is another picture. The only thing I can recognize is the word "Smith." So I am convinced it is either a portrait of Dr. SMITH of Ohio or Judge SMITH of Virginia, but I am not sure which one. This is supposed to be an exhibit, by the way, which truly represents what is going on here in America.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, is it important that it be determined which one it is?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, yes. I think we should address a resolution of inquiry to the State Department.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield briefly.

Mr. BUSBEY. I merely wish to advise the gentleman from Ohio that if he will read today's RECORD he will see where I inserted information showing

that 20 of these artists have definite Communist affiliations and backgrounds.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. BENDER. Is this picture supposed to be some part of a horse?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am not sure; it may be one of our modern State Department employees, at rest.

Mr. RANKIN. This one is of the Eleanor Club, I may say to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am glad to have that information, because I am totally uninformed as to what these pictures really do represent. I am just a dumb American who pays taxes for this kind of trash.

Let me say, with all the seriousness at my command, that if there is a single individual in this Congress who believes this kind of tripe is doing any good toward the advancement of world peace, or toward bringing a better understanding of American life, then he should be sent to the same nut house from which the people who drew this stuff originally came. Why, it is simply ridiculous that we put up with this kind of waste of the taxpayers' money for one moment. After all, we do have some responsibility, here in the Congress, to the people we represent. This material, of course, is quite humorous, but it is also a great tragedy that we have representing us today in our Government—in a State Department—those who would spend the people's money for this sort of stuff. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves and we should clean out those who are responsible for such a situation.

However, I have no criticism of General Marshall. He is a great man, with a reputation as an organizer, but he has not had an opportunity to reorganize the State Department. I say, however, that it is about time he starts to reorganize the State Department, or it will wreck him while he is abroad trying to represent the United States in world conferences. Until he does reorganize this department, until he does get rid of these people who not only are not truly representative of America, but actually do not understand America and cannot speak our language, we can only say: "No more appropriations for such nonsense."

I will support an information program whenever the State Department comes here and presents to the Congress the right kind of program; but until it does bring to us a proper kind of information program, which will be run by people who understand America and who are loyal to America, then I am going to oppose any appropriation whatsoever for this type of "bunk."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the statement just made by my friend from Ohio, and the reaction he got from the Membership shows just how impossible it is for us to make progress with this activity of the State Department until confidence in personnel is established.

I have been saying to friends in the State Department for some time that until Congress became convinced that the influence of the old OWI had been completely eliminated it would be impossible to get any money whatsoever for the carrying on of this work. The photographs which the gentleman from Ohio has distributed here on the floor is in the main a picture of the old OWI which I think was completely controlled by those who exercised an influence detrimental to our country as a whole. I feel, however, that it is due the assistants in the State Department who is in charge of this activity at the present time that I should say that I am convinced that since he took the position which he holds he has endeavored to clean up that branch of the Department over which he presides. I am not convinced, however, that the progress in this respect has been made that might have been made if the cleaning up operation had been handled with less care and tender consideration for the people who were responsible for the bad repute into which this branch has fallen. Mr. Benton is a man of great ability and if given fair support he would make a record of which all would be proud. There is no abler man in the State Department.

I want to make this observation, and I think I am correct, that in the expenditures that we are making abroad in order to promote our influence and protect our welfare it will not be possible to get full benefit of the money which is being expended unless we can take our story to the people that we are trying to help. You are not going to be able to combat successfully this foreign influence with money. It is going to take more than that. The good will and informational program which the State Department is carrying on is a thing that must be continued, but again I want to say for the benefit of the State Department it is perfectly apparent they will not get a dime until they have washed out this whole set-up and regained the confidence of the Congress to the extent that the Congress will believe that only those who are pro-Americans will be used to administer the program. This is something that Mr. Benton can do and will do if given proper support.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to call the attention of the gentleman from Georgia to the fact that no American drew those crazy pictures.

Mr. COX. I cannot think it reasonable to suppose that a sane person drew them or that a man with any common sense at all would have distributed them.

Mr. RANKIN. They are Communist caricatures that are sent out to mislead



the rest of the world as to what America is like.

Mr. COX. These pictures are the same kind of art that you saw so prominently displayed during the World Fair in New York. It is not the sort of Americanism which I, like the gentleman from Ohio, am able to understand.

Mr. RANKIN. Until there is a house cleaning of the State Department that is the kind of embarrassment the American people are going to be subjected to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is one of the most valuable Members of this House. He is hard-working and conscientious. He is diligent in the discharge of his duties. He is utterly devoted to the unpleasant task that has been assigned him, and he should have the sympathetic understanding and full cooperation of every Member of this House in trying to cut the cost of Government to the bone. I could say the same fine complimentary things about the chairman of the subcommittee, my good personal friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], who is handling this particular bill. Therefore it is with some reluctance that I must say that on this measure—and much to the amazement, no doubt, of many of my friends—I am forced to differ with these gentlemen.

I know you can resort to the art of satire and ridicule. Frankly I have practiced it myself on occasion. But this is too serious a matter to laugh out of court. This Foreign Information Service is in its infancy. It is a new set-up. I am aware that it has made many grievous mistakes; many of the parts of its program have been silly, and some of it has been downright dangerous. And, I agree with former speakers who have said that we need a housecleaning in the State Department. God knows that housecleaning is long overdue. Jimmy Byrnes got rid of a lot of the Reds, but some pinks still remain. I think General Marshall, if given a fair opportunity and sufficient time, will get rid of them. It is going to take more than a stiff broom furnished us by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. We will need a pitchfork and a scoop shovel. But, why should we kill a foreign-information program simply because of some mistakes that have been made?

I declare unto you that ideas are the most powerful weapons on earth. An idea is something that cannot be destroyed by a shell or a bomb.

Mind is more powerful than matter. John Huss, the Bohemian reformer and martyr, was burned at the stake, but the cause he espoused was not destroyed. Eighty-three years later a great Italian soul with irrepressible energy, unconquerable convictions, and flaming eloquence was hanged and burned, but his love of liberty, his sense of decency, and justice still live. Giralamo Savonarola is not dead! Abraham Lincoln was assassinated but freedom of the colored

race was not destroyed in this country, the Union was not divided, and the ideas of the Great Emancipator still live in the minds of men. Indeed, the Great Teacher of all time was nailed to a cross by an angry mob, but the Crucifixion did not destroy, rather it only served to encourage the growth and spread of Christianity throughout the world. Such is the power of an idea and an ideal.

"As a man thinketh, so is he." That is not only good gospel; that is sound psychology, and history is replete with instances that prove the truth of that statement. A nation is no different from an individual. As a nation thinketh, so is it. And, logically and inevitably, action follows thought.

What gave rise to nazism? What made Hitler possible? It was because of the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche. It was the doctrine of a superman, the super race that brought forth Hitler, Himmler, Goering, Goebels, and all their murderous gang. It was the philosophy of von Freitschke and von Bernhardt that "might makes right" and "necessity knows no law."

Perhaps one of the greatest mistakes from a selfish point of view, Great Britain made in the First World War was when she brought a million Indians and Hindus from India to the Western Front to do the housekeeping of the allied Armies. That million Hindus got a look and taste of European life. They became indoctrinated with Western ideas. They saw for the first time in their lives how other people were living. When the war was over and they returned to India, there were a million ambassadors clamoring for India's freedom. Gandhi, a successful barrister and honor graduate of Oxford, left South Africa and returned to India, and that movement for freedom has been going on in India until 375,000,000 people today are seething with revolt and rebellion, and the Indians will obtain their independence next year. Whether it will be for good or ill remains to be seen. Only time can tell.

I want to say to you gentlemen here this afternoon, in my opinion one of our greatest assets in dealing with Soviet Russia—and we will reap the benefit before too long—is the fact that for the first time in their lives hundreds of thousands of Russian soldiers were allowed to leave their own country and to penetrate the countries of central and eastern Europe. In spite of the devastation, wreckage and ruin, these Russians saw villages and towns and the way of life of other peoples in Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Germany, and Austria, preferable to their own.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. I appreciate very much this additional time.

These hundreds of thousands of Russians who came into central and eastern

Europe and mingled, more or less, in spite of the restrictions imposed upon them, with the peoples of other countries, have seen people living in devastated areas much better than most Russians have ever lived. Russia is recalling these soldiers from the occupied areas because she is fearful of the views they might express in clandestine meetings on their return home. She does not want her people to know the actual conditions in other lands. Recently I was talking to a good friend of mine who has spent several years in Russia and who speaks the Russian language fluently. He talked to me off the record. I asked him about conditions. He said, "Dewey, conditions inside Russia are terrible. The people are war-worn and weary. They do not want to fight anyone again." Of course, we know there are about 40 men who would set up world-wide communism at any cost, using every artifice, lie, trickery, and device in order to destroy the bourgeoisie and establish the rule of the proletariat. But I am convinced that these Russian soldiers who are coming back from Europe to their own country are dissatisfied with things in Russia. They are beginning to question, after all, this utopia that has been dinned into their ears and the lies that have been told them. They have seen for themselves life outside Soviet Russia and are now asking, Is life at home so good after all? They are thinking even though they cannot talk.

I say to you, the only way we can penetrate the iron curtain at this time is by the same sort of psychological penetration practiced by the Soviets themselves. It is that infiltration, that psychological penetration practiced by the Soviets that goes into every country in advance of their conquering armies. They soften the enemy before they attack. Their motto is, "Divide and conquer." How foolish it would be because of certain errors and grave mistakes made by this new infant agency to wipe it out altogether. If we hope to establish the free economic, democratic, way of life in this world, then we must assume these enormously increased responsibilities that have been bequeathed to us at the close of this global conflict. The only way we can penetrate this wall of secrecy today, unless we are willing to declare war and go in with our armies and drop our bombs, is by way of radio, the newspaper and the psychological warfare that saved the lives of hundreds of thousands of our soldiers both in the First and the Second World Wars.

In 1922 when I was a student at Heidelberg, I asked my professor, Herr Hoopes, one day who won the war. The answer was, "Lord Northcliffe's newspapers and Woodrow Wilson's 14 points are what won the war," because literally hundreds of thousands, in fact, millions of pamphlets containing the 14 points were dropped over the German lines. When the Germans picked up those pamphlets and read about the right of self-determination, of territorial integrity, they threw away their rifles and went home and refused to return to the front lines. In fact, the revolution broke out in Munich 60 days before the armistice in 1918, and that revolution assumed

far greater proportions than the outside world has ever guessed.

From this global conflict that has just closed General Eisenhower knows the value of psychological warfare, "Wild Bill" Donovan knows the value of it, and so does George Marshall, who only recently has made a plea that the Congress not abdicate these functions and obliterate this agency.

Let us clean it up and put it in order. Do not kill it. These men know that the psychological penetration we made not only to the armed forces of our enemies but to the subjugated peoples in occupied territories and citizens of the neutral powers did much to win us support of the underground and brought the war to a speedy termination, thus saving thousands upon thousands of American lives. So let us not act here wholly in a spirit of emotion or prejudice. William Benton, after all, regardless of what anyone here thinks about him, has proved himself a successful businessman. You do not have to argue to hard-headed practical businessmen in America about the value of advertising. Just read any magazine or newspaper. I know that Bill Benton is reasonable—he is approachable and agreeable—and I think he will welcome any constructive criticism that Congress may have to offer.

Mr. Chairman, today we are facing a war of ideas, a war between the totalitarianism of communism and the freedom of a constitutional representative Republic. Through the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs the Department of State provides a vehicle for presenting democratic ideas overseas and combatting the misrepresentations of the United States so prevalent abroad. I believe it is most important to this country that we maintain a vigorous foreign information program, and I hope that Congress will pass the bill recently introduced by the gentleman of South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], giving basic authority for the Department's foreign information activities, and I hope also that Congress will make available adequate appropriations for this important work. I realize that the appropriation in this bill for this specific activity is perhaps subject to a point of order because it is unauthorized and might be considered as legislation on an appropriation bill.

Recently some of us returned from the Near East, where we attended a meeting of the Interparliamentary Union at Cairo, Egypt. In Turkey and Greece we found that the Voice of America is coming through and reaching many people. If the Voice of America is stilled, and other activities of the United States Information Service terminated, we would have no effective way of combatting the wave of misrepresentation of the United States daily beamed to these and neighboring countries by Radio Moscow. We would be playing a game with two strikes already called against us.

As Ann O'Hare McCormick pointed out in a recent editorial article in the New York Times, the national interest requires that the Voice of America be heard where at present it cannot be heard.

In the World as it is, a world of competitive systems and competitive propaganda, the

United States has to compete in every way it can—

Mrs. McCormick said—

To win in this competition, nothing is so important as to make our system work politically, socially, economically. Retreat on any of these fronts is fatal to the cause of democracy everywhere. The next important thing is to let people know that it works. Money has to be spent to tell the story, to give the population of the Soviet Union and eastern Europe some idea of America other than the image etched on their minds by incessant false propaganda. If a thousand listeners in the upper ranks of the Communist Party hear the Voice of America it is worth the investment. Congress takes a grave responsibility in silencing a whisper that has already begun to echo as far away as Siberia and Baku.

For the fiscal year beginning July 1 the State Department has asked for approximately \$31,000,000 for its overseas information program. This is but a minute fraction of the amount proposed for the budget of the armed services. It is perhaps a fourth of the cost of a modern battleship, and represents only the cost of a few bombers. Expenditures for overseas information must properly be considered a premium for peace insurance, and if this money can help in promoting a better understanding of the United States abroad it will be producing dividends that will accrue to the benefit of future generations of Americans.

We must not lose the war of ideas by default. Today we battle for men's minds. Through the Voice of America and the other activities of the United States information service the facts about America and the American way of life reach into the countries behind the so-called iron curtain, giving support and nurture to the idea of representative self-government. We must always remember the potency of an idea. You cannot prevent people from thinking by bayonets. Keep the idea of freedom alive, and it may well be that in the long run the peoples now exposed to totalitarianism, terrorization, and communistic propaganda will halt the tide of communism and enable freemen to move forward as the basis of a new and peaceful world order.

We need friends abroad, and to win friends, it is essential that our policies be understood and fully known to the peoples of the world. We must be strong, with a stable economy, and the world must know that we are strong, with a sound economy, and not on the verge of an economic crash as hinted by the Moscow propaganda.

The information program is really part of our defense program, for one of its principal missions is to overcome the misrepresentations and correct the distortions that are one of the factors that may lead to another war. And another global war will spell the death of our modern civilization.

Short-wave radio is an effective instrument for reaching foreign peoples. It can reach illiterate people, and no censorship in the receiving country can distort or suppress its message. Outside the United States it is estimated that there are 20,000,000 radio sets capable of receiving shortwave programs. It is es-

sential that American democracy be able to speak with a voice of its own on the international stage. To silence the Voice of America, and halt the overseas information program would deprive us, in this critical period in international affairs, of an instrument vitally important in carrying out our peaceful objectives.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps it is because of my abysmal ignorance due to lack of education and travel and my brief service in this Body that it is utterly beyond my comprehension why or how Members in this Chamber can vote \$400,000,000 aid to Greece and Turkey and then refuse to vote less than one-twelfth of that amount to be spent in this essential work by our own Department of State.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I was in the Chamber at the time the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] gave the membership the benefit of looking at photographic proofs of some of the paintings that have been used by the State Department in its program. I noticed that as many Members looked at them it created a feeling of levity and there was some outright laughter. There has been a good deal of criticism about the paintings selected by the State Department.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know who selected these paintings for use in this information program, but I would not be surprised if perhaps nearly every one of the paintings that were exhibited had either received a prize or at least honorable mention in some of the exhibits of this country. I say that for the reason that it only occurred to me as I looked at some of them that my district has the honor of having located in it the Carnegie Institute, and that there for many, many years we have held national exhibitions of art, as well as international exhibitions, and within the past 15 or 20 years I would say that at least three-fourths of the time the paintings that won first prize were what is called abstract painting.

I know that I have never understood them, nor really appreciate their artistry. I believe that if it were left to the votes of the general public that the paintings awarded first prize, and which were selected by the board of artists who make the awards, would never have won first prize.

So, I suggest to you Members here today not to let the exhibitions of these paintings sway you in your judgment. Do not let it sway you in making up your mind as to whether or not this program being carried on by the Secretary of State is a good program or in the interests of the United States.

I know that every time in the last 5 years that first prize was awarded in an art exhibition at Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh practically every newspaper ridiculed the selection, ridiculed the award, and asked, in effect, "Who knows what this means?" "Is it art, and if it is art, I assume we do not know anything about art."

Even columnists who are nationally known, take it as their theme that we had better give up on the subject of art; that the general public does not know what art is. So I am jumping at



the conclusion that perhaps every one of these paintings that were shown to the membership this morning were paintings that had received either honorable mention, or a first prize, or other prize in an exhibition.

I join in everything that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] said, particularly when he called attention to the fact that we should not use ridicule or levity in order to arrive at a just and fair conclusion on this subject of an information program by the Department of State.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. In other words, if I understand the gentleman correctly, he means to indicate that he is not a connoisseur of art.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is correct.

Mr. JARMAN. But that he doubts seriously whether the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and other Members of this body, are any more connoisseurs than he is? I thoroughly agree with him if that is his position.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I just hope that a view of these reproductions will not have any effect in arriving at the proper conclusion.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I sincerely believe that if Members of Congress and the American people as a whole throughout this country cannot understand these pictures, that most certainly they ought not to be sent overseas.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not know how any board would select the pictures to be used, but I do not know of any better group to select than the board selected by the Carnegie Institute of Art. I do not think we should leave it to any lay group or to Members of Congress or any other such group. I do not see how we might do anything better than to select pictures that had won approval and prizes.

Mr. CHELF. If any pictures are sent abroad, we should see to it that they represent the American home or family life. Not some silly thing that resembles the north end of a south-bound freight train which inadvertently is headed west.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Probably there would be more disagreement about that than there is about these.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the omission from this appropriation bill of money for continuing the Department's information program should not be taken to mean that we are abandoning the program of broadcasting information about the United States to the nations of the world. There is now pend-

ing H. R. 3342 which proposes by specific legislation to authorize not only the broadcasting of such information to other nations but a program of cultural and educational interchange as well. The bill will undoubtedly be revised as the hearings and the debate show need for revision but the essential idea is there. The important point now, however, is that the failure to appropriate for the Voice of America broadcasting activities in this bill should not be considered anywhere as an abandonment of the basic American program for letting other nations know how we live, what we think, and what are our intentions. Such a program is a basic function of our foreign policy; for what is foreign policy if not a combination of men's hopes, aspirations, fears, and prejudices. Is it not true that the very thing we complain about now is lack of information in foreign countries about why we in the United States are spending enormous sums of money to help the world to reconstruct itself? The peoples of the world want to know whether this is cooperation in reconstruction or some new form of imperialism. Only information about ourselves will put down rumor and misrepresentation about our motives. Stories about the aggressive intentions of the United States, or its dollar diplomacy, will be found to have no validity by peoples who are given the facts about the United States. Even an expenditure of \$30,000,000 for such a program if it is found to cost that much to do the job right, should be found justified on the facts, for it is only one-third of 1 percent of the minimum amount of \$10,000,000,000 we are estimated to have invested in world reconstruction since VJ-day. An appropriation only for institutional advertising by any company in that percentage would be considered very modest. We have specifically written into the foreign relief bill the other day and the Greek-Turkish aid bill passed last Friday, provisions that representatives of our press, radio, and movies shall freely circulate in the benefited countries. We want to know a lot about them. Is it not just as sure that we want them to know a lot about us? I agree that such a program must be dignified, factual, and truly representative of the best in our country. But we are the leaders of the world in the techniques of telling a business story. It is high time we became leaders of the world in telling our economic, political, and social story. I fail to comprehend the limited view which would vote hundreds of millions for relief and foreign assistance and stop at voting a few millions for the right kind of a program to tell what we are doing and why. For the lack of these few millions the world and ourselves could easily lose the benefit of all the hundreds of millions. The bill for a foreign information program will come before the House in due course and I trust that it will be well received and passed, for that and that alone can be the justification for leaving out the appropriation now.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to this debate. I

cannot refrain at this time from expressing my opinion upon this very important piece of legislation.

We have lately concluded hostilities engaged in by more than 10,000,000 of our young men and young women. Many of those young men who survived that struggle sit before me in this House today. We are now engaged in a great struggle to win to our concept of government the peoples of the earth, because the future peace is bound up in the success or failure of the United Nations.

I am disturbed about the lack of an appropriation for the State Department Information Service.

In these days, following the close of the shooting period of war, we look hopefully toward a just and lasting peace. The whole world does. Many want peace the easy way. They want to shun self-denial and to run away from the hardships incident to obtaining peace. In our urge to forget the blood and tears of war and to return to the pursuits of peace in which we engaged before the war, we often lose sight of the fact that we have invested at least \$300,000,000 in this war and the peace which we hope will follow it. A considerable sum of money, to say the least. This vast sum of money is a minor item, however, when compared to the thousands of our finest young men and young women who lost their lives in this war. There are also the countless thousands returned to us broken in body and mind who are in our hospitals all over the world—victims of the fight to bring peace to the world.

America must be strong physically and spiritually to be able to help finish the work which these, our gallant sons and brave daughters, have begun at so great a sacrifice. We cannot do it by running from the issues. We cannot do it by dodging the responsibility.

We are not a warlike people. This makes it hard for us to keep prepared for peace. The realization that we must be strong for peace as well as for war is hard for the average American. The one necessity tends to confuse the other necessity in our concept of duty.

During these unsettled days before the treaties of peace are signed; before the United Nations, now in its infancy, has grown strong enough to keep the peace, it is necessary that we remain strong. We are a friendly nation and a generous people. We desire no advantage. Our hope is that the nations of the world will learn to live together as good neighbors. Nothing, therefore, can be a greater force for peace than a strong America, spiritually sensitive to justice.

My belief is that the first line of defense for peace in America is the composite will of the American people to see the United Nations succeed. To do that with the same unselfish spirit which we manifested during the war; it is essential that we have unity at home; that we be determined that all the suffering and heartache of this war were not endured in vain.

The second line of defense is our armed services. We must have an Army, a Navy, and an Air Force strong enough to make our presence felt wherever our

word is given in a world struggling for peace. Our armed services must be arms of justice and decency and freedom for all peoples and not for conquest, as they have always been in the past.

Our third line of national defense is a strong domestic economy. Right now we are having difficulties, including strife between labor and management, high prices, shortages, taxes, debt reduction, and all the myriad problems of our daily living.

Fourth in our line of defense is rarely mentioned in that connection, and it is the one that I wish to stress today.

I refer to the request of the State Department for funds to permit that Department to engage in selling America to the world in those places where our privately owned press, publications, and radio cannot go and do not go.

All over this land chambers of commerce are busy day and night selling to their neighboring communities and to the world at large those things which set these particular communities apart as special attractions to the home seeker, the industries seeking locations for plants, and as places of rest and recreation for people on tour. Millions of dollars are spent this way each year in the United States selling good will.

The United States today is the leading country in the world in its freedom, its culture, its industry, and its religion. We must keep that leadership. Developments in radio and air transportation have made us next-door neighbors to every other place on earth. We are only 60 hours away from the farthest part of the globe in travel and only an instant away by radio.

It is not enough that we be strong physically. As I have said, we must be strong spiritually. We must have an abiding belief in the concept of the brotherhood of all mankind; to be aware of the hunger and heartache of our brothers in all places. If we have that spirit, then we will want to tell our story to the world and we will tell it with our heart in it.

Unfortunately, selfishness still plays a big role in world affairs. We, ourselves, do not have entirely clean hands on that score. As a result, misunderstandings and jealousies have arisen between neighbors, and in some places our story is not told nor is it received. America must accept that challenge in its true sense of good will and tell her story in its full light wherever there are people to receive it—by press, by radio, by messenger. When people know all the facts they can be trusted to solve the most difficult problems. Let us give the State Department the funds needed to carry on this work in conjunction with the press and radio of our country. The State Department must go where private means of communication cannot go because of the cost involved and consequent loss to private enterprise in the effort. No greater defense from war nor a greater force for peace can be developed than a complete understanding of one another's problems—and that understanding can never be had without the people of the world having the full and complete truth.

If we can get our story told, the most doubting neighbors will completely un-

derstand that we, in America, long for peace above everything in the world; that we have neither the desire nor the intent to try to impose our ideology of government upon anyone on this earth; that it is our ideal of government that the lowliest citizen has the same rights as the most powerful; that a man can worship God in the manner which pleases him; that he can get up anywhere at any time and criticize his public officials from the President of the United States down to a constable in the smallest township. He can do this and have no fear that he will be stood up against a wall and shot for doing it or of even being punished at all; that his son or daughter, born and reared in the most humble of circumstances, can become the President of a great university, the head of a great hospital, the pastor of the greatest church, or even the President of his country. Yes; when people all over the world understand what our heart is and what our soul is, then we will be far nearer to a just and lasting peace.

Often the news from this country is distorted as it reaches other lands. Where nations are in strife economically or in war, the news is often colored to fit the pleasure of the one sending it or disseminating it. The opposition pounces upon the mistakes which have been made and magnifies them and never mentions the good which may have been done. Statements are studied and selections from the statements are taken which are least favorable. They are pulled from the context and told as the truth. This happens, unfortunately, among nations and is not conducive to better understanding.

What we are endeavoring to do is to get the truth across firmly but in friendship.

When some other nation misunderstands an act of one of our citizens and erroneously jumps to the conclusion that his acts and statements represent the thought and will of America, we must combat that with the most powerful weapon we have—the truth.

What we want the world to know is that here in America we are a country of divergent interests yet withal we are one of the other. The mills of the North and the East, the grain of the great Midwest, the cotton of the South, the cattle ranges of the West and Southwest, the booming new industry of the Pacific coast, are all part of this great land; labor, and management, and Agriculture dependent upon each other to such a degree that the economic illness of the one affects vitally the other two. Our churches, our schools, our hospitals, are all monuments to the free expression given to the everyday, average American. It is America.

This one ideal must exist throughout the world. Otherwise, from generation to generation, the youth of our country will be called upon to go forth to fight to preserve this democracy. And that because those of us before them failed in our duty and ran from our responsibility.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, we have been quite liberal in the matter of time for general debate. So far we have merely read the enacting clause of the bill. We have not started reading the

bill itself. I am sure there will be plenty of opportunity for every Member to speak under the 5-minute rule.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the enacting paragraph do now close and that we start reading the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Salaries and expenses, Department of State: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; salary of the Under Secretary of State, \$12,000; health service program as authorized by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658); not to exceed \$26,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Department of State; purchase of uniforms for chauffeurs; purchase of 14 passenger motor vehicles, including 1 at not to exceed \$3,000; and dues for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only, or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members, newspapers, teletype rentals, and tolls (not to exceed \$15,000); rental of tie lines; stenographic reporting and translating services by contract and services for the analysis and tabulation of technical information and the preparation of special maps, globes, and geographic aids by contract, all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; expenses as authorized by title VII (except sec. 705), of the Foreign Service Act of 1946; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid for the issue of passports as authorized by law (22 U. S. C. 214a); not to exceed \$40,000 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail of the Department of State as required by the act of June 28, 1944; the examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; and maintenance and operation of passport and despatch agencies established by the Secretary of State; \$20,000,000, of which \$2,000 is for claims determined and settled pursuant to part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (act of August 2, 1946, Public Law 601): *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,000 of this appropriation may be expended for necessary expenses, except personal services, in carrying out the provisions of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930," approved June 12, 1934, as amended (19 U. S. C. 1354).

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARY: Page 2, line 18, after the semicolon insert "acquisition, production, and free distribution of informational materials for use in connection with the operation, independently or through individuals, including aliens, or public or private agencies (foreign or domestic), and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, of an information program outside of the continental United States, including the purchase of radio time (except that funds herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75 percent of the effective daily broadcasting time from any person or corporation holding an international short-wave broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of such licensee), and the purchase, rental, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of facilities for radio transmission and reception, the acquisition of land and interests in land (by purchase, lease, rental, or otherwise) for radio broadcasting and



relay facilities, and the acquisition or construction of buildings and necessary improvements on such lands; purchase and presentation of various objects of a cultural nature suitable for presentation (through diplomatic and consular offices) to foreign governments, schools, or other cultural or patriotic organizations, the purchase, rental, distribution, and operations of motion-picture projection equipment and supplies, including rental of halls, hire of motion-picture projector operators, and all other necessary services by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; not to exceed \$13,000 for entertainment."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order this is not authorized by law and it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order so that the gentleman may be heard.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to restore the information and cultural program to this bill.

May I say that if the information and cultural program is one-tenth as effective abroad as it has been in this country, it is worth 10 times the amount that we spent or will spend for it. In this country it has the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chasing the Circus Lady and the sedate chairman of our subcommittee reading the Memoirs of Hecate County.

Now let me read to you what the committee offers as an alternative program to the present information and cultural program of the State Department. On page 7 of the committee report there appears this language:

The alternatives to this program, it would seem, are (a) UNESCO, a United Nations undertaking and in which a tremendous interest is developing, and which, as established, will truly represent the views of American people.

I have no disposition whatever to criticize UNESCO. To the contrary, I hope that it will accomplish the purposes for which it was organized. But let me read you what the same committee in the same report on page 12 has to say about UNESCO:

The committee could not understand why, out of the total of 132 executive personnel already employed by UNESCO, only 14 are from the United States, and out of a total of 259 clerical personnel only 7 are from the United States. It is hoped, however, when this Organization is more firmly established, that a proper ratio of personnel from the United States will be employed.

The committee recommends as an alternative for the Voice of America that we turn this program over to UNESCO, and in the same breath complains that UNESCO at the present time has a personnel recruited almost entirely from other countries. I submit that the Department of State is the more logical and

a better qualified agency to interpret America to the rest of the world.

We have heard a lot of criticism of this program. The Wallace program was mentioned on the floor a few moments ago. I hold in my hand a copy of the Wallace broadcast that was sent over the Voice of America. I challenge any one in this House to point out any place in this broadcast where Henry Wallace is praised. As a matter of fact, it is a review of a book on the Wallace family, a family which for a long time adhered to the Republican Party. Now, here is what the broadcast said:

Through the history of this family there runs, like a red thread, the eternal struggle for an improvement of the situation of the American farmer. Whenever the members of this family turned to agriculture and its problems, their achievements were considerable. When they turned to other problems, the success was dubious.

I know of no program which has been more abused than this program which has been conducted by the Information and Cultural Service.

Gentlemen, we should not junk this program at this time, over the protest of General Marshall, and over the protest of other men who are serving this country in foreign fields. Secretary Harri- man has said, "I could not properly have discharged my duties either at Moscow or in London without it."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Does the gentleman from Nebraska wish to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. STEFAN. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GARY. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. It is the opinion of the Chair that the amendment does propose legislation on an appropriation bill, the functions therein referred to not being authorized by law.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARY: On page 3, line 1, strike out "\$20,000,000" and insert "\$30,000,000."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is this: On yesterday I called the attention of the House to the fact that not only had we eliminated the program of the Information and Cultural Service from the bill but in the office of the Secretary of the Department of State we had tremendously reduced the regular appropriation. The Secretary of State under the item of salaries and expenses in the Secretary's office and for the work in this country asked for \$47,046,000. This amount was reduced to \$20,000,000, which was a reduction of \$27,000,000. Of that \$27,000,000, \$21,874,000 was for the Information and Cultural Service. One million seven hundred and sixty-nine thousand dollars was for the Intelligence Service, and the balance was for the regular activities of the Department.

The \$21,874,000 has been ruled out on a point of order. I seek by this amendment to restore \$10,000,000 of those funds, \$5,000,000 for the regular activities of the Department and \$5,000,000 for those activities within the Office of Information and Cultural Affairs which are authorized by law.

There are certain activities which are definitely authorized by law. One of those is the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation, which is a definite program of the Department of State and is carried on by this office. Another is the UNESCO staff itself. In other words, we have recognized the international organization of UNESCO, and we have placed in the State Department and in the Office of Information and Cultural Affairs the necessary funds for the State Department to cooperate with that organization in an effort to work out its program. That amount is \$157,000. In addition, we have the Division of Libraries and Institutes, which is authorized by law, and the Exchange of Persons Division, which provides for the exchange of students and technicians between the various countries.

The amendment which I have offered will merely restore to the Office of the Secretary the amount he requested of Congress and which he said is essential to carry out the functions of his office. It also restores the cuts in the intelligence program, a very essential program, and those portions of the information and cultural program which are authorized by law.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment seeks to restore the OIC, which was taken out of this bill on a point of order. The Committee on Foreign Affairs is holding hearings at this time to get some legislation to restore this program.

We have to start cutting down some of the expenses of government. The people have been asking us to do it. It is necessary. Let me point out to the Congress the statement regarding the growth of the Department of State and the number of employees. We state in our report that the salaries and expenses totaled \$2,728,347 in 1940. They jumped to \$3,453,000 in 1941. In 1942 they jumped to \$4,377,105, and in 1943 the salaries jumped to \$5,986,800, and even up to something over \$13,000,000 in 1946. With a total of personnel running from 1,010 in 1940 to 5,270 at the present time, and proposed for 1948, excluding personnel for the information and intelligence programs, it is extremely difficult for this committee, during this period of need for economy and when the people are asking for economy, to reconcile itself to a need in excess of \$18,000,000 for the regular activities. This amount is included in the bill.

The increase in salaries for the Foreign Service under the act that was passed by the House places a burden of \$7,000,000 annually on the backs of the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I urge you to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I trust the Committee will indulge me for a moment, and, if necessary, for the purpose of being in order under the rules of the House, I shall have to address my remarks to the last two words in line 21 on page 2; namely, the words "penalty mail." It has no doubt come to the attention of the House that through editorials and circulars and statements by postmasters and by protests from home that through the alleged action of the Congress a great many substitute clerks and carriers have been dismissed from the postal service. It has been made to appear that this is due to some lack of action on the part of the Congress. We have noticed some headlines in aggravated areas, such as Boston, where hundreds have been dismissed, and in Long Beach, Calif., where an aggregate of 150 were dismissed. The Subcommittee on Appropriations convened a hearing this morning for the purpose of isolating rumor and confusion from the truth so that the country might well know just exactly what happened. Copies of these hearings will be published and made available to the Members in short order. There you will find a statement by Mr. Jesse Donaldson, First Assistant Postmaster General, as to exactly what the facts are. It was through no laches on the part of Congress and through no negligence on the part of any committee of the Congress that these sundry gentlemen, including a great many veterans, have been dismissed from the rolls. The fact of the matter is that the Post Office Department knew there was going to be a deficit for the current fiscal year as early as January 1947. To be sure, they could not ascertain the amount of the deficit, because the postmasters make only quarterly reports. Yet Mr. Donaldson told us this morning in the hearing that it was obvious to them that a deficiency of at least \$10,000,000 would exist as a result of the increased cost of Christmas mail and various strikes along the seaboard and the maritime strike, but they could not ascertain the dollar amount of that deficiency until the quarterly reports had been filed. Just as soon as those had been compiled, an estimate was referred to the Bureau of the Budget. They had a hearing before the Budget Bureau on the 21st day of April 1947. I want you to anchor that date in your memory. The Budget Bureau sent up a deficiency estimate on the 9th day of May 1947, which was Friday of last week—a deficiency estimate in the sum of roughly \$11,000,000 for the purpose of taking care of the salaries and expenses of the hundreds of veterans and others who have been dismissed from the rolls in every section of the country. So that estimate came up on last Saturday and in consequence there has been no opportunity for the Congress of the United States to take action thereon.

We confronted Mr. Donaldson point blank with the question whether or not there had been any fault or any lack of

diligence on the part of the members of the committees of Congress, and he said, "None whatsoever."

There, then, you have the answer to such things as a 2-inch headline that has been appearing in the Boston newspapers that through lack of action on the part of Congress, hundreds of veterans and substitute clerks and carriers have been dismissed from the rolls. There you have the answer to the headlines that appeared in the Long Beach newspapers and in other sections of the country as to whether or not the Congress has been at fault in bringing about the dismissal of literally hundreds of people. The negligence has been somewhere else besides Congress.

In addition thereto I might say a great deal of confusion arises from the fact that while we are dealing with 1948 estimates, that matter should have been taken care of before now in a deficiency estimate that is chargeable to 1947 appropriations, and for reasons best known to the Post Office Department, to the Budget Bureau, and to the President himself, that was not done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Representation allowances, Foreign Service: For representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724), \$500,000.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: On page 7, line 21, strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$250,000."

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to strike out the item of \$500,000 for so-called representation and to insert in lieu thereof \$250,000. What we ought to do is to strike out the entire item of \$500,000. I trust, however, the Committee will go along with me and save at least \$250,000 of the taxpayers' money that ought not to be spent for such purpose. There is no good reason at all why this item should be in the bill.

I do want to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], who has given this bill and this particular item a good deal of attention, not only on this but on other occasions.

The State Department, through its representatives, asked for more than \$1,000,000 for this representation. Just think of it. You would not believe such request would be made right now when we are trying to economize. The committee did a good job in cutting it to \$500,000, but it ought at least be cut in half again.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to my distinguished friend from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. What is this "representation"? I do not know what that word means.

Mr. REES. That is just what I was about to explain to the Members.

This money for what is called representation is spent for liquor. I will say that probably 90 percent of this money goes for liquor.

Mr. MASON. What?

Mr. REES. Yes; liquor of various kinds. "Representation" is a high-powered phrase, but the money buys high-powered liquor; and it is used by our representatives to entertain foreigners abroad. Also, in some instances, to entertain themselves.

As I said on yesterday in discussing this matter, we fall to a pretty low ebb in our diplomacy when we resort to this method in order to get along with, and cultivate friendships with, the representatives of other countries.

Here is what has happened: In 1938 we spent about \$125,000 for this purpose; in 1939, about the same amount. Then the allowance was doubled and we spent \$250,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman said, "The same amount." He does not mean the same amount of liquor, does he?

Mr. REES. No; I do not know how much liquor was bought; I am talking about the amount of money they spent. We do not know how much liquor was purchased because the thing is covered up. The gentleman from New York and I discussed this matter on yesterday. I thought he might have access to rather accurate figures as to the amount of money spent for liquor, but it seems you cannot do it because these vouchers are regarded as confidential information and we just cannot find out. I will venture the statement, however—from the information I have gathered—that at least 90 percent of the fund is spent for liquor.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. There is a question of consistency which bothers me. This House only a day or so ago voted \$5,000 to entertain the WCTU here in Washington. Today it is called upon to spend \$500,000 to buy liquor for entertainment.

Mr. REES. It is sort of blowing hot and cold with the same breath in my estimation except that this item is 100 times the amount allocated the WCTU. They will, in my opinion, do more good with \$5,000 than the State Department with the \$500,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the gentleman's position that in order to do away with liquor that might be served with the meals that we should also do away with the meals?

Mr. REES. Not necessarily. Let me come to that.

Mr. O'KONSKI. The liquor costs more than the meals, does it not?

Mr. REES. It would be interesting to get figures as to how much is spent on



meals. The meals cost \$5, \$7, \$9, and even \$12 apiece. This money is spent by our representatives not only to entertain foreigners but to entertain themselves and their friends.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. REES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan who has always supported me on similar amendments.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just wondered, following up the statement of the gentleman from New York, about doing away with the meals, that if you gave them enough liquor they would not care anything about the meal they got.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I just do not believe the members of this committee understand that our representatives abroad receive pretty fair pay. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee called attention yesterday to the fact that many of them get as much as \$50,000 a year. As a matter of fact, all one of these representatives has to do is pack his suitcase. Everything else is fixed for him abroad. His home is there ready for him and for his family, with all of the equipment and all of the help necessary to run it, everything he wants for himself and family all paid for by his Government. I do not criticize that in this discussion. If the representative happens to be located in a warm climate and is transferred to a colder climate the Government will care for him and his family and see that they get the proper accessories to go with the colder climate. And yet in addition to that you put this additional sum in here to be used for so-called entertainment. It does not make sense.

I do not know whether the membership realizes it or not, but under suspension of the rules last year we added \$7,000,000 in funds to provide for these representatives we are sending abroad. It was for additional salaries and expenses. You come to the House with this item of a half-million dollars, which is all unnecessary and uncalled for.

I would like to call attention to something else. I believe I am right in this, and I shall ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska, if he wants to tell me. I want to refer as to how some of this money was spent over in Yugoslavia. I understand they have even gone so far as to use similar funds to entertain General Tito over there, spending a considerable amount of money entertaining him and in entertaining him I am sure there was a goodly supply of liquor. Surely no one thinks any good was accomplished by that entertainment. May I ask the gentleman from Nebraska if he wants to comment on that? I think he might be able to furnish some information.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, I am going to oppose the gentleman's amendment

because I think the committee has done a pretty good job in reducing this \$618,000. With reference to Tito, there has been premature publicity regarding that.

Mr. REES. I saw some publicity on it and for that reason I am asking the gentleman to explain this matter to this committee.

Mr. STEFAN. It has been published but I did not give permission to publish it. It was the premature publication of some information I had. It is true that some of this money has been spent unwisely and for that reason the committee made these cuts.

Directly answering the gentleman's question, I feel very deeply about spending the American taxpayers' money to entertain a dictator like Tito and his Communists who murdered our heroic aviators. I think I am duty bound to answer the gentleman's question. It is true that before Tito and his Communists murdered our five aviators they did entertain Marshal Tito and his friends with the American taxpayers' money at a dinner costing \$600. Shortly after that they entertained him again with your money at a dinner costing \$400 or more.

Mr. REES. A total of more than \$1,000 for a party given in honor of Marshal Tito.

Mr. STEFAN. There were other entertainments and then they shot down 5 of our aviators. They were continually entertaining Marshal Tito with their representation allowance, which is, in fact, a prestige allowance. I accidentally ran across some vouchers. I did not look for them purposely, I did not look for this information on purpose, but I did find an item for a wreath for the victims of this so-called air accident in the amount of \$13.40. Shame on them. Of course this committee, the minority members as well as the majority members, was shocked.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, the distinguished ranking minority Member [Mr. ROONEY], the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN], and the rest of us took cognizance of this terrible thing. Of course, we took cognizance of the wrongs they do with their money sometimes, but we do not want to castigate the fine Foreign Service officers who are in our employ, and who cannot be blamed for some of the wrongs that some of these people do. We have been giving representation allowance to our Foreign Service officers ever since we sent our first missions to foreign countries to represent us. It is absolutely necessary, and I want to pay a tribute to those Foreign Service officers who have been decorated during the war and who rendered such a wonderful service to the United States in every part of the world. There are many fine Foreign Service officers among them,

and this representation allowance is something that has to be appropriated for from year to year, but it must be a modest sum. I have great faith in General Marshall. I have great faith in men like the Under Secretary and others who are watching this fund, and we have to give General Marshall a chance to clean this up. I want a good State Department and a fine Foreign Service Department, and so does every member of this committee. We may have political differences among us, but they are not displayed in committee. Sometimes on the floor of the House it does creep up. As I say, we have to have a good Foreign Service and a good State Department. But, we have to have authority in law for everything that is done, and it must not be done without the consent of the peoples' Representatives here in Congress. I oppose the gentleman's amendment, I am sorry.

Mr. REES. I appreciate the gentleman's position. He is here on the floor and expected to defend this particular item, and I appreciate his statement. But, here is a fair certainty I do not castigate the services of our representatives abroad. Not at all. They have rendered impressive service. But that does not justify the waste of taxpayers' money in this way. The gentleman from Nebraska has given a glaring example where more than \$1,000 was spent in Belgrade for two dinners to entertain Marshal Tito. How our representative could do it in view of the circumstances just recited by the gentleman from Nebraska is more than I can understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to say to the gentleman from Kansas that I fully agree with my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska. As far as I am concerned, I would not buy a glass of water for Marshal Tito. However, insofar as this item now under discussion is concerned, I would like to say to the gentleman that I recall recently having had a conversation with Secretary of Commerce Harriman who told me that when he was Ambassador to Great Britain, in London, he had a luncheon, which was expected of him because of the fact that all of the Embassies in London representing the various countries served a luncheon at some time or other during the year. This one social event at which about 1,200 people attended more than ate up the entire annual allocation of funds to our Embassy in London for the purpose which we are now discussing.

Mr. REES. I realize these representatives are called upon to do a consider-

able amount of entertaining, but it is terribly overdone. And the liquor part of the thing is beyond all reason. If you have \$500,000 to be used to cultivate friendship with foreign people, you will go a lot further in creating understanding by using it to buy food for some of the hundreds of thousands of human beings who are on the brink of starvation. Last year this committee allocated more than \$600,000, most of which went for liquor. I just do not believe we can point with pride of any accomplishments in the way of mutual understanding by reason of that expenditure. If you can see anything worth while that was done in this respect, I would like to know about it. Cut this item \$250,000 and you are still spending about as much as was spent in 1942 and in 1943 before the State Department went on this spending spree.

Before I leave the floor I call your attention briefly to a copy of a magazine that was handed me a few minutes ago. It is entitled the American Foreign Service Journal. It is a monthly magazine published here in Washington. I am informed that the Government in some way renders some assistance to this magazine. It is a rather small magazine. The thing to which I call your attention is that six full pages of this publication are devoted to advertisements of liquor. I trust you will support my amendment and save at least \$250,000 for the Federal Treasury.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I remember 2 years ago the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] offered an amendment, and I supported the amendment at that time, to reduce the amount from \$800,000 to \$400,000. I rise at this time first to compliment the committee. The administration raised the request from \$800,000 2 years ago to over \$1,118,000 for this year. I find a change in the House this year. The committee has reduced this amount from over \$1,118,000 to \$500,000. That is just an idea of economy on the part of the majority party that is now in control of the House. The committee should be commended. I should really like to see this amendment adopted further reducing the amount to \$250,000. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars will buy considerable liquor with which to supply our Ambassadors and other people who represent us with that little extra that goes into entertainment at state dinners. I really think when economies are so hard for us to make here, by reason of the opposition by the administration on every appropriation bill that comes up, that we ought to save \$100,000 or \$200,000 or \$250,000 at every opportunity that presents itself. I should like to see this committee vote to reduce this amount by 50 percent, \$250,000. I am sure it will not hurt our Foreign Service. Just think, that would buy a lot of food for the starving children of Europe, which would do a great deal more good than to oversupply our Ambassadors with this opportunity for entertainment by the use of liquors, which are not at all times absolutely necessary, to say the least. I hope the amendment is sustained by the House. There are a thousand places here in our

own country where we can do a real service in the expense of this saving of \$250,000. Why not vote now against this waste?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that we cut this representation allowance from \$1,118,000 to \$500,000, which compares with \$800,000 they had last year. It is my sincere feeling that General Marshall, the head of the Department of State, and the Assistant Secretary for Administration and others are now going into these matters. The Foreign Service, from what has been said on the floor of the House today, should know that the funds we are allowing today should be used for the purpose originally intended; that is, as a prestige allowance, which has been in the foreign service of all governments since we have had a mission in foreign countries. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I would hate for the impression to go throughout the country that we are appropriating any such sum as \$500,000 for liquor. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has suggested that he thought that 90 percent of this fund was spent for that purpose. As a matter of fact, this item covers all the entertainment, including banquets and the various functions that are given in all the embassies in foreign fields. Is that not correct?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; of course, it is included for all representation allowances. If our Ambassador of the United Kingdom to some function, he returns the courtesy. This money is expended for music and flowers and service, food, and so forth.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. REES. The gentleman does not mean that this \$250,000 is the amount that is expended for all these meals and parties and all of these things that are going on, including the entertainment here at Blair House, where we spend so much money for liquor? The gentleman does not mean to impress us with the idea that that is all the money that is spent on these dinners?

Mr. STEFAN. No; I am not trying to impress on you anything of the kind.

Mr. REES. I know the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. STEFAN. I am trying to impress upon you that it has been the custom, since we have been sending missions to foreign countries, to have prestige allowances.

Mr. REES. They call them prestige allowances and, therefore, we proceed to spend money to buy liquor and we use that as a means of trying to get along with foreign countries. That is the whole sum and substance of it.

Mr. STEFAN. Does not the gentleman feel that this has been cut considerably?

Mr. REES. I feel the gentleman has done a splendid job in cutting from over \$1,000,000 to \$500,000, but to me it is perfectly silly that anybody would ever have the nerve to come in and ask for this money. I will warrant that General Marshall did not come before the gentleman's committee and ask for this \$1,000,000. He did not ask for \$500,000. He did not even ask for \$250,000. Some representative of the State Department must have come down here to take care of this allowance, and I will warrant that even though I was not present, that I am sure is the way it happened. It was not any of the top-flight men who came and asked for this money, you can be sure of that.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to the attention of the Members that the hearings on Department of State appropriations are available to all the Members of Congress, and the hearings are complete insofar as the representation allowances are concerned.

Mr. REES. The hearings are available, but the items for which this money is spent are not available to the Members of Congress, are they?

Mr. STEFAN. I am sure that I would be very happy to give the gentleman all the information that I have in my possession.

Mr. REES. I would certainly be happy to have it and look over it.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman would be very enlightened and surprised.

Mr. REES. And I would be surprised, I am sure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES) there were—ayes 32, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, in order that the House may receive a message, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3311, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. WILEY, Mr. SMITH, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. GEORGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.



## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD as of May 16, 1947.

## ASSISTANCE TO PEOPLE OF COUNTRIES DEVASTATED BY WAR

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 153, providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. EATON, Mr. VORYS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BLOOM, and Mr. KEE.

## DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3311, with Mr. CURTIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I probably could criticize these appropriations as well as anyone in the Committee, but I wish to direct my remarks to the information and cultural program of the State Department in this section of the bill. I concur in the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], in expressing confidence not only in Secretary of State Marshall but also in his Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Peurifoy. I think it was very unfortunate that General Marshall had to go to Moscow so shortly after taking office.

I repeat, I probably could criticize the State Department as well as anybody, and I propose to show where it should be criticized.

It was very unfortunate that, by Presidential directive, so many people who were Communist and pro-Soviet in their thinking were transferred from the OSS, the OIC, the OIAA, and various agencies to the State Department.

Mr. Chairman, I have given considerable time and study to the activities and composition of the Cultural and Information Division of the State Department. Therefore I wish to take a little time to discuss this matter which is at present under consideration by the Congress.

Let no one assume that my attitude is one of hostility toward a constructive

program of international information in behalf of the United States. Such a program is an urgent need, in the light of the propaganda barrage emanating from the Soviet Union and its Communist agents all over the world, attacking the United States as a war-mongering tool of the monopolists seeking world conquest, oppressing its own people, lynching Negroes, and guilty of every crime in the calendar of human sins. But the activities of the Cultural and Information Division of the State Department must not be confused with a sound program. As carried on today, they are a monstrosity costing the Nation millions of dollars, and serving no constructive purpose for the United States. Conducted by a group of pro-Communist fellow travelers and muddle heads, they fill the ether and tons of paper with a combination of material favorable to the Soviet Union and the Communists, or just plain twaddle.

Let me give you some idea of the personnel conducting the present program. Top-flight assistant to Mr. William Benton is William Treadwell Stone, Director of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs. Here is his record:

Member of the editorial board of *Amerasia* from 1937 through November 1941. Chairman of this board was Frederick Vanderbilt Field, now a regular columnist for the *Daily Worker* and a member of the Communist Party. Managing editor was Philip Jacob Jaffe, indicted and fined for the possession of confidential Government documents, charged by Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO on November 28, 1945, with being in close touch with Earl Browder, until recently head of the Communist Party, United States of America, and Tung Pi Wu, Chinese Communist delegate to the San Francisco Conference. Mr. Stone's membership on the editorial board of *Amerasia* covers the period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact during which this magazine described the war in Europe as imperialistic, declaring that—

Germany, industrially powerful but poor in resources and weak financially, is attempting to take by force what Great Britain possesses.

Jaffe's Communist alias was J. W. Phillips—*Washington Daily News*, June 7, 1945, page 1. Mr. Field was executive secretary of the American Peace Mobilization, a Communist front which picketed the White House during the period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact.

Writing in *Amerasia* of August 1937, together with such well-known defenders of Soviet foreign policy as Frederick V. Field, Edgar Snow, and Harriet Moore, Mr. Stone comments as follows on relations with Japan:

Nevertheless, the case against invoking the Neutrality Act, as presented by the State Department and a considerable section of the press, is not altogether convincing. . . . on the other hand, if the events at Shanghai have precipitated a general war, as seems likely, a policy of drift which allows munitions shipments and trade in war materials to continue would not advance the cause of peace or reduce the dangers of American involvement. . . . Furthermore, the possibilities of collective action under neutrality have apparently not been explored by Washington (p. 293).

This statement should be compared with the official line of the Communist Party, U. S. A., at the time as expressed by Earl Browder, its spokesman in an NBC broadcast on August 28, 1936, as follows:

How long will the American people, who have so convincingly shown their unmistakable desire for peace, continue to hold aloof from collective efforts for peace which alone can check the war plans of the Japanese militarists in the Far East and of their ally, Hitler, in Europe? . . . President Roosevelt—hangs on to a policy of so-called neutrality or isolation which in practice has encouraged the Fascist aggressors. . . . It was this ineffective method which emboldened the Japanese militarists to advance their war plans against China and the United States.

The following article—quoted in part—is taken from *Amerasia* of October 1940 published under joint editorship of Mr. Stone, Mr. Jaffe, Mr. Field, and others, apparently with their full knowledge and approval. The article is entitled "American Far Eastern Policy; For Democracy or Imperialism?" by Frederick V. Field and reads in part as follows:

Our Government is, as it has repeatedly stated, interested in the imperialist status quo. . . . Finally, it may be said that I am expressing an isolated, private view. . . . Over the Labor Day week end more than 22,000 men and women, of whom 6,000 were delegates, met at the Emergency Peace Mobilization in Chicago. . . . Two thousand went on to Washington to lobby and demonstrate against the conscription bill. . . . Because to them the building up of a great military machine for the purpose of becoming a partner in a war of rival imperialisms is not consistent with true national defense. I say, therefore, that the views I have expressed are not those of an isolated individual. Rather, they are the views, springing from deep convictions, of millions and millions of Americans who refuse to be duped into war or into an American form of dictatorship and fascism.

No statement appeared in *Amerasia* to challenge this viewpoint, by Mr. Stone or anyone else.

Again, under the joint editorship of Mr. Stone, with Messrs. Jaffe, Field, and others, there appeared in the January 1940 issue of *Amerasia* an article by Harriet Moore entitled "Two Wars or One," from which the following excerpt is quoted:

It—

The United States—

should exert its influence to stop the European conflict as soon as possible by means of negotiated balance-of-power peace.

No statement appeared to challenge this viewpoint.

Mr. Stone was formerly with the Budget Bureau as administrative consultant at \$9,800. He is said to have drawn up the plan for the Cultural Division of the State Department.

He has been in charge of selection of personnel for foreign broadcasting.

He is reported to have appointed George Shaw Wheeler, while Stone was in London for the Board of Economic Warfare. Wheeler has a long record of Communist affiliations and activities. Because of this record, Wheeler was removed by the Civil Service Commission

and later reinstated as a result of left-wing pressure.

Next we have Haldore E. Hanson, Assistant Secretary of the Office of Information and Culture. Here is his record:

Assistant Secretary and the official lobbyist for the Office of Information and Culture.

Mr. Hanson has spent most of his adult life since leaving school as a free-lance writer in China. He wanted to study, but, as he says:

When the school year drew to a close, I decided to join a group of professors and journalists in Peiping, headed by Edgar Snow<sup>1</sup> and his wife,<sup>2</sup> who were organizing a new political magazine.<sup>3</sup>

He held other positions which some of his superiors considered so important that he was excused from military service. One of these positions was in the Department of Agriculture.

A further indication of the varied and colorful background which he brought to the Department is in an article written about him—Review of Reviews, February 1937, page 95—in which he is referred to as smuggler, soldier, and diplomat. In view of the fact that his military service was not with the United States armed forces, it would be well to learn with whom and for what he fought.

Mr. Hanson can best be judged, however, by his own writings: A. The People Behind the Chinese Guerrillas, published in Pacific Affairs, September 1938:

In this article, he shows that he enjoyed the complete confidence of the Chinese Communists—and that they do not tolerate anyone who is not completely on their side—the official Communist position.\*

First. Page 285:

To assess the strength of the self-defense governments and the mass movement supporting the guerrillas, I spent 2 weeks traveling through guerrilla territory in central Hopei in March 1938 and brought back copies of nearly all of the official documents of the government in addition to my own observations.

That is, he was given official documents by the Communists, and given safe conduct through their lines.

Second. He shows that the central Hopei mass movement with which he was identified was definitely a part of the official Communist plan.

Third. Mr. Hanson, apparently himself a well-grounded student of the writings of Marx and Lenin could judge the actual knowledge of Marx which the Chinese Communists had.

Page 290:

Naturally the political leaders trained in the anti-Japanese academy are familiar with the writings of Marx and Lenin and have not abandoned their hopes for a socialist republic.

Page 303:

#### MAO TZE-TUNG'S LONG VIEW

China has the second largest Communist Party in the world. The leader of the party lives at Yen-an. Next to Stalin he is the most powerful Marxian thinker and leader

in world politics today. I asked for an interview with Mao Tze-tung. (From Humane Endeavor, p. 303.)

Fourth. Mr. Hanson, further, proudly—almost boastfully—shows how completely the Communists accepted him into their confidence. He states:

(a) The guerrillas do not tolerate neutrality: A man is either for or against them (p. 296).

Mr. Hanson was at all times given safe conduct through the Communist lines.

I have traveled in the commander in chief's motor car.

(b) I spent 4 months at the close of 1938 with the north China guerrillas. (The Nation, April 8, 1939, p. 401.)

Page 254:

(c) Thirty miles south of Wut'ai I came upon two Canadian doctors. One was Dr. Norman Bethune,<sup>4</sup> a surgeon from Toronto who was sent to China by the American Committee for Medical Aid to China.

Fifth. Mr. Hanson, with more enthusiasm than objectivity, tells of the aims and achievements of the Chinese Communists.

Page 296:

The Communist agents frankly tell their visitors that they hope the present war will produce a democratic government in China, which will be only one step toward the ultimate goal of a socialist state. \* \* \* This goal was asserted by Mr. Huang Ching, the Communist representative at the Fuping conference when he stated: "The Communist Party is determined to support the formation of a democratic republic and to execute the duties laid upon it by this new political power."

Page 298:

Despite this continued vision of a future Chinese Soviet the qualities of leadership at the Central Hopei headquarters would seem to indicate that the Communists will not fight any more civil wars. \* \* \* This Red leadership is characterized by a bulldog attitude toward the ultimate goal, a flexibility of methods, an attitude of self-criticism toward all present work, a willingness of experiment, and a complete absence (so far as I could see) of personal ambition. The same qualities have marked every great movement in history which has survived the decades of adversity to reach the pinnacles of power. (North China, May 1938.)

Humane Endeavor, page 32:

The Red leaders organized the masses, gave them discipline and something worth fighting for.

Humane Endeavor, page 79:

Russian policy among the Outer Mongolians appealed to the common people by exposing the corruption of both the priests and the princes; aristocratic privileges were abolished; machinery for a democratic government, dominated by Russian advisers but employing whatever educated Mongols were available, was set up at Uрга in 1924.

Page 101:

Despite all these apparent handicaps the Communists became the most powerful peasant armies in the history of revolution.

<sup>4</sup> After the death of Dr. Bethune, the Daily Worker told that he had been a member of the Communist Party. The Worker further told that Dr. Bethune had served with the Spanish Communist's Army in the medical corps, and that he had played the hero role in a Soviet picture, Spain in Flames.

They had three qualities which brought armies success \* \* \* a mastery of mobile warfare, skillful political propaganda, and superb leadership. \* \* \* The revolutionary land policy was a second reason for Red success.

It would be well to see who in the Department as well as outside the Department urged Mr. Hanson's appointment to Cultural Affairs, and who in the Department urged his rapid promotion. Evidently under fire of recent criticism, Mr. Hanson has been transferred to the Political Affairs Committee of the State Department.

Another members of the leading triumvirate in Mr. Benton's office is Charles Alexander Thomson. In a study entitled "The War in Spain," published in Foreign Policy Reports of May 1, 1938, page 39, he has the following eulogy of the work of the Communists:

To the Communists must go the major credit for the introduction of order and unity in this nondescript army. \* \* \* On the Government side, the most important political developments have been: (1) the rise of the Communist Party; (2) the working alliance effected by the Communists with the right-wing Socialists and the Republican Parties \* \* \*; (3) the decline of Communist influence and its later resurgence in the cabinet formed on April 4, 1938. \* \* \* When Franco troops approached Madrid early in November 1936, a new and decisive foreign influence appeared on the scene. Russian aid had arrived—not only airplanes and tanks, but also advisers, technicians and the forces of the International Brigade, in many instances recruited by Communist agencies. Thanks in great part to Soviet influence, the Spanish revolution was not destined—as has so often been the case in history—to pass from the hands of moderates to those of extremists. Instead, the Communists cast their weight against radical trends; they proclaimed that the purpose of the war was not to advance social revolution, but to defend a legal and democratic government.

The Spanish Communists must be credited with significant achievements. They led in transforming the militia into a disciplined army, and encouraged a unified command. They worked to unify and strengthen the central government as against the local committees. They put a check on wholesale socialization of industry and collectivization of agriculture. They sought to substitute discipline under centralized authority for the spontaneous and disorderly enthusiasm of the masses. They demanded that the social revolution be definitely subordinated to the task of winning the war.

The Communists, whose numbers had not exceeded 50,000 prior to the revolt, derived power to enforce these policies from various factors. First, of course, was aid from the Soviet Union. A second factor was superior organizing ability, shown by their success in marshaling support both within the army and behind the lines. The Communists won the allegiance of General Miaja and many other officers, largely controlled the commissar system and the censorship, and were particularly strong in the Madrid forces and in the aviation corps. In the third place, the Communists skillfully exploited a policy of moderation toward socialization of industry and agriculture, which gained the support of numerous middle-class elements, notably small business men and the richer peasants. In consequence their numbers showed a marked increase, being estimated at 220,000 in January 1937, and 400,000 in September of the same year.

<sup>1</sup> A prominent pro-Soviet writer on China.

<sup>2</sup> Under the pen name of Nym Wales, wrote extensively in support of Soviet policy.

<sup>3</sup> Page 30, Humane Endeavor, by H. Hanson.



This report is in complete contradiction to the statements of numerous anti-Franco authorities to the atrocities and disruption committed by the Communists under their Russian commissars in the Spanish Civil War.

According to Mr. Carlton J. H. Hayes, former American Ambassador to Spain, in his book, *War-time Mission to Spain*, Mr. Thomson was responsible for the appointment of Abel Plenn as cultural attaché in Spain. Mr. Plenn's ideology can be determined from his recent book, *Wind in the Olive Trees*, which is severely critical of every phase of American policy in Spain during the war. His pro-Communist bias is evident throughout the book which has been enthusiastically promoted by the Communist press and Communist book shops.

According to the *Daily Worker* of July 4, 1946, page 11, Mr. Thomson entered into hearty cooperation with Tom Brandon, producer and distributor of pro-Communist films. This is enough to show where Mr. Thomson stands.

It will be remembered that the personnel of the Cultural Division is in large measure a legacy from Communist permeated OWI, and the regime of Archibald McLeish. How does it happen, for example, that Mr. Armand D. Willis, cultural attaché in Moscow, suddenly burst into the press attacking American Embassy officers as Russian haters? Is this appointment an accident or is it typical of the Cultural Department in general?

Who was responsible for the selection of Mr. Lau Shaw, who made a tour of the United States as a guest of the State Department? Later Mr. Shaw wrote an article on Hollywood Films in China for the pro-Communist magazine, *Screen Writer*. In this article he assailed American movies as having "no educational and no cultural attitude and intention."

Who was responsible for sending as a delegate to the Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization of the United States Prof. Harlow Shapley, who, in spite of his scientific attainments, has an enormous record of affiliations with Communist-front organizations and defense of Communist causes?

Who was responsible for the appointment of Robert T. Miller, Chief in Charge of Publications, who has since been forced to resign and whose record is one of dubious loyalty to the United States?

Who was responsible for the appointment of Charles A. Page, former cultural attaché in Paris, whose membership in the Communist Party and the Young Communist League is testified to by verifiable Government files?

Who is responsible for the appointment of Stefan Arski, alias Arthur Salman, alias Kalimovski, contributor to the Communist Polish publication, *Novy Put'*? Arski's Communist record was previously exposed by Congressman Joseph P. Rytter. I do not know what his citizenship status is, but today he is public-relations officer of the Polish Embassy. How does Mr. Benton account for this transition?

Who was responsible for the fact that Jo Davidson, active in numerous Communist-front organizations, has been engaged by the State Department to

make numerous busts of Latin-American ex-Presidents at a handsome remuneration?

Who was responsible for the invitation to visit the United States issued to two writers and two engineers from Communist-ruled Kalgan, expenses to be paid by the American Government? These men were Chow Yang, vice president of Kalgan's North China Union University; Oyang Shan-chun, playwright; Nih Chun-jung and Li Su, engineers.

Dr. Esther C. Brunauer was selected by the State Department as United States representative to UNESCO with the rank of minister. Speaking over NBC on May 31, 1946, at 6 p. m., she declared:

There are many barriers to the concept [of peoples speaking to peoples]; there are the barriers \* \* \* of monopolistic practices to be overcome.

What did Dr. Brunauer mean by this? What country was she criticizing? Was she aware of the fact that she was echoing Soviet propaganda against the United States? Has this lady ever taken a critical attitude toward conditions in the Soviet Union? Evidently, again under fire of recent criticism, she has been shifted to the Office of Public Liaison in the State Department.

Now let us take a glance at the activities of this coterie. Much is made of the Russian broadcast. I am all for effective broadcasts to the Soviet Union. The voice of free America would be welcome if it could reach the Russian people, but there are certain difficulties of which Mr. Benton has not adequately informed the American people. In fact, he has misled them to believe that there is free and easy access for American broadcasts to the Soviet Union. He has not told you that all receivers must be registered at the nearest post office in Russia. What reason have we to believe that a dictatorship like the Soviet Government, with concentration camps, terror, and firing squads would freely admit a broadcast from a foreign democracy? Why should Stalin set up an iron curtain against the press and suddenly withdraw that curtain at the request of Mr. Benton? As Mr. William Philip Simms, the noted columnist, said in the *Scripps-Howard* press of December 21, 1945:

Mr. Benton's department can no more speak to people of the Soviet Union than it can speak to the people of Mars. And the same can be said of the steadily expanding areas under Soviet control.

Mr. Benton boasts of having received letters from recipients of messages from America. How does he know that these people are not stooges who have sent their letters with Government knowledge and approval?

According to John Crosby in the *Washington Post* of April 27, 1947, the State Department broadcast not only the views of Henry Wallace, who was attacking the State Department, but even those of the *Daily Worker*, which called the Truman doctrine "a national shame."

Of what use is it to the United States to broadcast a talk on the Julliard School, the description of Louisiana, the function and organization of the Supreme Court, and surgical refrigeration is-

sues? What guarantee has Mr. Benton that anybody is really listening to these things?

According to a dispatch from Moscow in the *Washington Evening Star* of February 18, 1947, only a comparatively few Russians heard the United States State Department's first Russian language broadcast. The *Star's* dispatch says:

The United States has an elaborate pictorial magazine, but schedules and wave lengths dealing with the State Department programs have not been published in it.

On April 14, 1947, the State Department broadcast a supinely apologetic statement by David Lawrence in which he pleaded with the Russians as follows:

Let us confess that we each have made mistakes and that we, for instance, may misunderstand even now what you are doing in the Balkans, in Greece and Turkey, in Korea. \* \* \* We are not without sin. You mentioned the Negro question. Be patient with us.

Is that the tone which a self-respecting nation should adopt toward a ruthless, expansionist power? Following this broadcast, Mr. Lawrence was duly assailed by Ilya Ehrenburg, Soviet spokesman, whereupon he issued the following abject apology:

If it will help matters, let me present my humblest apologies and regrets for anything that I may have ever written derogatory to Russia and may we all let bygones be bygones with respect to everybody's past writings on other sides.

How the Russian power politicians must have laughed at this spectacle.

Miss Elizabeth Egan, Acting Chief of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs in Moscow for 2½ years, has herself admitted the limitations of broadcasts to the Soviet Union. In the *Washington Post* of January 16, 1947, she is quoted as saying that there are few short-wave sets in the Soviet Union—the average family having a plate which is turned to the local station only.

Mr. Benton has made a great to-do of the publication of the magazine *Amerika*. George Moorad, a Moscow correspondent and author of *Behind the Iron Curtain*, has described the American project as follows:

The American effort was not serious enough to warrant unusual curbs. Since we were printing in New York, the text had to be translated into Russian, cabled to Moscow for censorship and correction, cabled back to New York, and finally printed in Russian. Then came the matter of shipping some thousands of copies into Moscow, when transport was available, and the result was only two issues during the 7 months I was there. Our own American difficulties were so staggering, it was hardly necessary for Soviet bureaucrats to devise others.

Mr. David Sentner, writing in the *Los Angeles Examiner* on January 15, 1946, has described the steps in publishing *Amerika* as follows:

The proofs are first sent to Moscow for Soviet approval. The Russian Government censors the contents and sends back the approved portions. \* \* \* No copy of the magazine has ever been seen on a newsstand in the Soviet Union. \* \* \* Why do we permit the Soviet Union to censor an American Government publication when the Union

of Soviet Socialist Republics issues through the Soviet Embassy a weekly bulletin of information which is uncensored Communist propaganda and in violation of the Foreign Agents Registration Act?

Indicative of what is going on inside of Mr. Benton's Department is the following quotation in the pro-Communist publication *In Fact* for January 21, 1947. It evidently followed numerous leaks in the Department. I quote:

Unless the State Department sets up a United States Gestapo to intimidate its employees into silence, the secret and confidential directives will continue to reach the light.

This was an open invitation to the employees of the Department to divulge confidential information to Communist channels. One would think that as a result of this statement which reached Mr. Benton that he would act decisively, determine the sources of the leaks, and reorganize his Department in the most drastic manner. Again we have to rely upon *In Fact*, which apparently is well informed as to what is going on in Mr. Benton's Department. In the issue of April 8, 1946, appeared the following:

Sixteen days after *In Fact* exclusively published the pattern of State Department propaganda operations and printed authentic propaganda directives issued by the State Department to implement its objectives, an official order by Assistant Secretary William Benton to his propaganda staff, marked "confidential," declared that after February 6 the use of the term "directive" would no longer be used and that henceforth all such propaganda directions will be referred to as guides. It can now be revealed that within 24 hours after the *In Fact* publication of the propaganda-directive exposé, top State Department officials met in closed session to plan their strategy.

In other words, Mr. Benton made a full retreat in the face of the pro-Communist gang in his Department.

Another point: I would like to know who was responsible for the invitation the United States tendered to Anthoon Koejemans, editor of the Dutch Communist paper *De Waarheid*. The Communist Workers of February 3, 1946, stated that the gentleman "is now in the United States on a six-man delegation of Dutch newspapermen, sponsored by the State Department's Office of International Information."

I should also like to know who was responsible for the display of the film entitled "Now the Peace," produced by *World in Action* on August 1, 1946, before State Department employees. This picture was severely critical of the American system of free enterprise and was thoroughly Communist in tone.

Characteristic of the chaos in Mr. Benton's Department is the incident described in the *New York Times* of March 30, 1947, in which Mr. Benton announced that "the relay transmitters at Munich, which beam the daily short-wave program of the State Department to Russia, were sabotaged recently and the broadcasts were turned away to South America." A subsequent investigation resulted in a complete whitewash of the incident, although a later report admitted

that a German Communist had been employed in the broadcasting station.

The *Daily Worker* of April 30, 1947, in the column conducted by Barnard Rubin, publishes in detail a summary of a State Department directive to its international broadcasting division. Has Mr. Benton ever made an inquiry as to how the *Daily Worker* secured this directive?

Mr. Benton has himself shown a certain apologetic attitude toward the Soviet Union. In the *New York Times* of March 4, 1947, speaking at Atlantic City, he is quoted as saying that the Soviet Union spends three times as much for education as does this country. I seriously doubt the authenticity of this estimate.

The *Motion Picture Herald* of July 6, 1946, has reported a number of film enterprises undertaken by the State Department. One is entitled "Banjo Pickin' Boy," produced by Irving Lerner, who has a long list of Communist affiliations.

The criticisms made of the activities of the Cultural Division are too numerous to cite here. Let me repeat, however, the statement made by Congressman TABER that this branch is "loaded with people whose loyalties are not with the United States." Let me mention the titles of some of the films distributed by the State Department to enhance the status of this Government: *Grasshoppers*, *Tennis Rhythm*, *Reproduction Among Mammals*, *The Farmer's Wife*, *Willie and the Mouse*, *Music for Tiny Tots*, *Chicken Little*, *Unit Cast Partial Dentures*.

Congressman STEFAN on April 11, 1946, declared that State Department programs channeled to the Caribbean area, with a population of 31,000,000, reach only 45,000 families, the number with usable receiving sets. Moreover, he said the programs are broadcast in English, which is understood by only a small part of the population.

You are all familiar with a recent broadcast of a book review of the biography of Henry Wallace and his family at the very moment when he was criticizing the policy of the State Department and being applauded for it by Communist audiences throughout the world.

Mr. Benton, who appears before you with a request for \$31,000,000, does not explain how he proposes to tackle the difficulty which he confronted in Belgrade, when the doors of the American reading room and library were shut down. Indicative of the loss in prestige which we have suffered during the period of Mr. Benton's promotion of our stock is the fact that the French Government did not hesitate to shut down our radio station in Algiers as a result of Russian pressure.

Our Ambassador to Argentina has clearly outlined the ineffectiveness of Mr. Benton's outfit in Latin America. He declared that communism had made great strides in the southern hemisphere. He pointed out that Communist organizations in Latin America had received large funds from Moscow and were doing over-all propaganda against economic and political imperialism with the United States as the chief target. This report has been corroborated by W. H. Law-

rence in the *New York Times* of January 1, 1946, when he declared:

A propaganda effort helpful only to the Soviet Union and harmful to the United States is under way throughout Latin America through formal channels of the Communist Party, including its newspapers and radio stations.

Mr. William H. Newton, well known Scripps-Howard staff writer in China, has made the following report of State Department incompetence in the *Washington Daily News* of January 6, 1947:

The United States Information Service here is under orders from Washington to confine its activities to publishing official documents, innocuous Government releases, and press dispatches. Both the Information Service and American consular employees are aware of the beating the United States is taking on the propaganda front, but no one is permitted to do much about it. \* \* \* The steady day-by-day impact of the Communist propaganda is having its effect here, particularly since our Government's principal response is stories about the TVA and photographs of the little red schoolhouse in Georgia.

Another sample of sheer waste in the Cultural Division of the State Department is the appropriation for the publication of an elaborate *Who's Who* of personages in Latin-American countries. God knows how much good that will do.

Let me mention in passing also that in the Baltic states—grabbed early in the war by Stalin—all short-wave radios have been confiscated and domestic radios are forcibly tuned to Kremlin broadcasts.

Let me ask of what earthly use is it to us to broadcast Benny Goodman's jazz, Turkey in the Straw, Night and Day, cowboy tunes, and a description of infrared photography while the Russians are lambasting us as power-hungry imperialists.

Charles Coulter, who just returned from a year in Europe, testified to the ineffectiveness of State Department broadcasts in the *Washington Post* on April 14, 1947. He said:

In something like a year spent in Europe recently, I tried again and again and again to listen in to the American broadcast. I could not pick up the broadcast. On the other hand, I could and did receive Russian, English, Swedish, Danish, and other European broadcasts, and even numerous programs from Africa, from Cairo to the Cape.

Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, distinguished editor of the magazine *the Americas*, has testified, according to the *New York Times* of January 5, 1947, to the inexcusable inefficiency of the State Department's program in Latin America:

One reason for the formidable Marxist infiltration throughout Latin America is the singularly inept and sadly ineffective nature of the State Department's Division of International Information and Cultural Affairs. \* \* \* Dr. Thorning called for "intelligent use of the taxpayer's money at a time when the shadow of Red fascism hangs over the entire world and is exploiting every conceivable issue, false and true, in order to undermine the good-neighbor policy in the Western Hemisphere. \* \* \* What is required is not a great appropriation by Congress but rather some measure of imaginative



resourcefulness, artistic presentation of the abundant material we have, and an alertness in meeting and overcoming the totalitarian propagandists."

The eminent observer Constantine Brown, has described the effect of State Department cultural activities in Paris in the *Evening Star* of February 21, 1947, as follows:

The United States has spent many hundreds of millions of dollars in assisting France since her liberation, but few in France realize or appreciate this fact. . . . the great majority of French people are firmly convinced that the Germans were defeated by the valiant bravery of the Red Armies. . . . They (Mr. Benton and his assistants) aim to inform foreign countries about the United States, but are reluctant to do anything which might be interpreted as propaganda.

Perhaps the greatest hoax put over on the American people has been UNESCO, over which that great poet and fellow traveler, Archibald MacLeish, is the chief architect. Mr. MacLeish has been associated with numerous Communist-front organizations and has written poetry which has drawn the acclaim of the Communist press. Mr. MacLeish is sharply critical of things American. Speaking before a meeting of the American Civil Liberties Union in New York on February 22, 1947, he said residents of foreign countries distrusted America's vast communication powers, the radio programs produced by advertising agencies in New York and the mass-produced day dreams of this country's motion-picture industry. They are afraid we will destroy the richness and variety of the several cultures of the world. He said the United States had undergone an extraordinary deterioration of the will to peace.

Mr. Benton has paid tribute to Mr. MacLeish, declaring that "There is no American—nor anyone in the world for that matter—who has contributed so much to the formation of UNESCO and to the writing of its charter."

According to the *New York Herald Tribune* of April 14, 1946, the UNESCO constitution calls for "the wide diffusion of culture and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace."

Kenneth Lindsay, of Oxford, a leading educator who represents English universities, has ridiculed this conception in the *New York Times* of November 23, 1946. He is quoted as follows:

I see danger of trying to produce, instead of concrete specific proposals, a whole world of philosophy. If UNESCO is going to try in a Europe, which has got Roman Catholics and Communists and other distinctive creeds, to produce another creed, I foretell that it will be doomed.

In spite of UNESCO's announced cultural and educational aims, it is significant to note that no public- or private-school teacher has been invited to serve as a delegate to this Organization.

It will be remembered that the Soviet bloc in the United Nations has consistently fought for the severance of relations with Franco-Spain. We understand, of course, the exigencies of Soviet power politics involved. It is interesting to note that UNESCO invited representatives of the Spanish Republic to its meetings in conformance with the Communist line supported by the entire Soviet

bloc, and in contradiction to the procedure laid down by the United Nations.

The placing of control over information and culture in the hands of a centralized agency like the State Department or UNESCO on an international scale is fraught with serious dangers. According to the *New York Times* on September 27, 1946, UNESCO proposes the revision of textbooks and other teaching materials used in schools and colleges throughout the world. Who will determine the nature of this revision? Will it be the left-wing ideologists in the State Department and the UNESCO?

Robert McLean, president of the Associated Press and publisher of the *Philadelphia Bulletin*, in a speech delivered in Philadelphia on January 17, 1947, denounced the plan for a Government merger of all communications beyond its shores and the establishment of short-wave radio broadcast, charging that the Government had arrogated "to itself in fact a power of censorship—for the power to determine what shall be sent out connotes the power to determine what shall not be sent out."

The Motion Picture Association, according to the *Washington Post* of January 11, 1947, accused Assistant Secretary of State Benton of trying to bend the movies to fit "a synthetic Government propaganda."

A statement issued by Joyce O'Hara, assistant to President Eric Johnston of the association, said:

What the American people fear is the type of culture which Mr. Benton proposes to spread abroad. Mr. Benton would do far better if he followed the traditional policy of his own State Department in opening up world channels of news and information instead of trying to remake the patterns of American culture.

We are being asked to provide \$31,000,000 for State Department information services while it is being steadily excluded from country after country. World Report of October 15, 1946, lists the following exclusions of this kind:

Shut-down of Belgrade library of the United States Information Service; Bulgarian censorship of United States Information Service material; Polish restrictions on the scope of United States information; censorship in Hungary; etc.

Mr. Speaker, again I repeat that I believe cultural and information activities are essential for the security of the United States. We are now experiencing a propaganda offensive directed against us in all parts of the world. To defend ourselves we should first of all make a thorough house cleaning and liquidation of the present monstrosity in the State Department, and then set up an efficient machinery which insists and obtains complete reciprocity with the various countries with which we have treaty relations, and which will provide the Congress from time to time with concrete and adequate information based upon facts and check up as to the effective operation of this machinery.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

PRICE PROPAGANDA VERSUS COMMON SENSE

Mr. Chairman, the potato surplus problem of the United States admittedly

is not our most important problem, but it furnishes an example of the hundreds of problems which we must solve if our people and the people of the world are going to attain maximum prosperity and good living in the coming years. For this reason, I want to discuss the potato surplus problem again today.

To millions of Americans who know very little about potatoes except that they like to eat them, it may not seem worth while to worry about the potato surplus problem, particularly in view of the larger problems that confront us. However, we in the Congress know that all of the little problems piled up make a very big problem, just as a lot of little potatoes piled up make a mighty big surplus. This year that surplus is 100,000,000 bushels, a large part of which went to waste.

The potato problem impinges on other problems facing us as legislators today. What we do, or fail to do, in formulating a program to do away with the potato surplus will affect, to some degree, the tax rate in the years to come. It will affect our Government's operations. It will affect the prices consumers must pay for potatoes, and the kind of potatoes the housewife can buy at the corner grocery store. It will even affect the price of the wheat that goes into the bread which most Americans eat every day, as I shall prove a little later.

Mr. Chairman, the potato surplus problem even has an important bearing on our overseas relief policy and on our export program of commodities generally. Just last Friday, May 9, the Department of Agriculture put out a release stating that nearly 10,000,000 bushels of potatoes from the 1946 potato crop have been shipped abroad under the Department's export program. In the course of the release, the Department noted:

Potatoes were made available for export as soon as they were harvested, but foreign countries at that time had sufficient quantities for immediate use and preferred to purchase grain. In early spring, however, it was possible to arrange for appreciable exports in spite of the difficulties involved in the handling and shipping of fresh potatoes.

It is significant to note these words, for they bear out a contention I have made before. Other nations are in our wheat market here, buying huge quantities of grain for use as flour. Many times these governments purchase flour. Our own Government purchases wheat in our relief program. This forces up the price of wheat and other grains in this country. If potatoes were processed into potato flour, the flour could be shipped instead of the wheat flour and the other nations would be glad to get it. Fifty thousand carloads of flour could have been produced from this year's surplus potatoes, most of which were destroyed.

Yes, Mr. Chairman; what we in this Congress do about the potato surplus in the long run will even help determine the prices consumers have to pay for many items which they purchase for use on the farm or in the home.

For these reasons, every American and every Member of Congress ought to learn a little more about the potato-surplus problem that seems to grow worse with

each passing year. A study of the problem gives us more insight to solve not only this problem but a multitude of others now before Congress and eventually to come before Congress.

It is true that several groups of Americans already are studying the potato-surplus problem and that the Department of Agriculture is offering every co-operation to me and to others that are seeking better means of disposing of the potato surplus. But it is also true that there is too much apathy on the subject and that the average individual must be made to understand that he will benefit materially if Congress goes into action on the potato-surplus problem.

The potato-surplus problem is important to several distinct groups in America. As we will see, none of these groups is small. As a matter of fact, every one of us is a member of one group or another that is affected by the potato problem.

First. The problem is important to the potato farmer. Right now, the average potato farmer is getting a good price for his product, but he knows—as we all know—that when the price of his product depends on artificial factors, that is, Federal price supports, sooner or later the problem will get out of hand with disastrous results to the potato grower himself.

Second. The problem is important to the thousands of independent bakers throughout the Nation. They are now paying an abnormally high price for flour. They lately have seen the price of flour go higher and higher, while at the same time they have held off putting into effect all the price increases at the retail level they should have put into effect to get their usual mark-up.

Wiser bakers have been chagrined to see their own Government working to make prices higher, while at the same time President Truman has been waging a fictitious war on high prices.

Take the present high wheat prices, for example, and consider these in the light of the potato surplus. If the Government, instead of spending \$80,000,000 this year to support potato prices, would have built several plants for processing potatoes into potato flour, roughly 50,000 carloads of potato flour could have been shipped overseas in this crop year. Think of it. This flour could have been shipped instead of a comparable amount of wheat flour which, because it was sent overseas, actually helped boost American prices for flour. In other words, such activity by the Government as I have suggested actually would have helped keep prices down in the United States—and eventually reduced them down to the housewife's table.

As every economist knows, the supply of any product, or a substitute that is as good or better than the product, has a great bearing on the price the product demands. The present administration continues to think in terms of price ceilings, or allocations, or controls, in relation to prices, while at the same time overlooking the supply factor. This supply factor is in reality our biggest worry, at least for the time being, and the President could do more about

bringing prices down by following policies that will increase production, or byproducts, that by making pretty speeches about the Newburyport plan, or any other similar plan based purely on publicity.

If we had had the foresight to process our surplus potatoes last year into potato flour, the people of Europe would gladly have taken it as a substitute for the wheat flour we had to ship abroad. It is just as good and just as nutritious and just as flavorful as wheat flour. They could have used it to make bread, to make potato soup, or to make potato gravy. Or, had they chosen, they could have used it in a variety of other ways. The flour not used for human consumption could have been fed to cattle or poultry and its food value ultimately realized by human beings. As it was, we dumped millions of bushels and shipped a comparatively little of our surplus to Europe, with the likelihood being that many of the potatoes were not worth consuming by man or beast by the time they arrived there. This can conveniently go on year after year with millions of people in need of food. Lives can be saved if action is taken now.

By so constructing and operating these potato-processing plants to prove the usefulness and profitability of making potato flour, our Government actually would have added to our assets as a nation. Furthermore it would have been taking a big stride forward toward a solution to the pressing potato surplus problem which hangs heavy over our heads year after year. Private industry could lease or buy these plants from the Government, and by promoting consumption of potato flour in America, actually could do away with the potato-surplus problem.

The thoughtful bakers of this Nation already are recognizing the usefulness of adding a potato culture to their regular wheat-flour mix in baking bread. More than 300 bakers already use potato culture in their operations and others are turning to it each day. They, in effect, are helping already to solve the potato-surplus problem, while at the same time actually increasing the consumption of wheat. The ratio of wheat even in bread with potato culture is very great, and an increase in consumption of potato bread means an increase in consumption of wheat in the long future.

Third. The problem of the potato surplus is important to consumers in America. As we have seen, because the Government has failed to attack forcefully and logically the problems presented by the potato surplus, more wheat flour has been shipped abroad, thus forcing up its price at home. In addition, the American housewife has had to take a poorer grade of potatoes at the corner market than she should have had to take. If the Government converted surplus potatoes into flour, the culls and the lower grades could be used, thus leaving only the best, or United States Standard, grades of potatoes for purchase by housewives to serve in their homes.

Fourth. The problem of the potato surplus is important to taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, I will now give startling figures of interest to every man, woman, and

child in America, as well as everybody all over the world. This year we are spending \$80,000,000 on potato support prices because of a 100,000,000-bushel potato surplus. Now, \$80,000,000 may seem like chicken feed in these days of billions for loans, grants, and gifts to other nations, but it is still a very imposing sum to most Americans, and if we could cut out this expense without hurting the potato farmer, we would be doing the Nation a great service. This \$80,000,000 represents virtually a net loss to the United States Treasury. We Republicans have promised economy in government and this potato-surplus price is one of the best ways we can start practicing economy, yet not upset the prices which potato farmers are getting and deserve to get.

If, instead of spending the \$80,000,000 on support prices, the Government had invested a few million dollars in potato-processing plants to turn surplus potatoes into flour, there would have been none of the dumping of potatoes we have all read about and most of us have deplored. There would have been no eventual loss to the Government, the taxpayer or the consumer. There would have been a net gain, in actuality. All of the potato surplus can be converted into flour and stored for 3 years, or more. It can be shipped over seas and used to obviate the need of sending that much wheat flour abroad. Or it can be used at home in the baking of bread, cake and many other products. There is no rhyme or reason ever in destroying an agricultural surplus as long as our scientists retain their ingenuity in finding new uses, our industrialists retain their will to distribute and their "know-how" to produce, and as long as our people will accept new, flexible policies that will add to our national wealth.

Henry Wallace, who currently is in disfavor because of his Russian stand, was never more wrong in his life than at the very beginning of his career in the New Deal government when he sponsored and put into practice his "plow-'em-under" ideas. We all lived to see the disastrous results of that policy in the long run. Yet, the Department of Agriculture still is following a "plow-'em-under" policy on potatoes. The only difference is that today the potatoes are dumped after having been grown and harvested and shipped at great loss of time and effort.

I know that my colleagues will agree with me that men who are public-spirited and do things in the public interest should be praised on the floor of Congress, whether they are in government, business, or take part in other legitimate endeavors. That is why I have no hesitancy again in praising Jack Schafer, the president of Peter Pan Bakeries in Detroit, Mich., who has put forward a plan to solve this potato surplus and to restore a normal economic price to potatoes in the United States.

Jack Schafer, who is no relative of mine, also is president of Schafer-Varney, Inc., which company serves other bakers throughout the Nation with potato culture, made from potato flour and other products. As an active businessman, he travels into all parts of the Nation and contacts independent bakers, large and small. He tells me that they



are very worried about the price of flour and the results of such prices in their operations. He says that the whole baking industry sees the need for new thinking and that bakers are turning to the use of potato culture in increasing numbers to add flavor and goodness to their product and to overcome buyer resistance which continues to develop as wheat prices climb.

I mention him because I want to pay tribute to his initiative and to his stick-to-itiveness. He has studied potatoes as an active grower, as a salesman, as a marketer, and now as the manufacturer of a potato culture, and he deserves the thanks of all Americans for the time and thought he has given to the potato-surplus problem and possible solutions to it.

He and hundreds of other bakers have endorsed the House resolution which I have introduced. This resolution provides for a study of this whole potato-surplus problem by the Committee on Agriculture and for the formulation of a plan of action that will bring relief to the American taxpayer, the American consumer, the American baker, and will help both the potato farmer and the wheat farmer in the long future. I again urge support for this study among all Members of the House of Representatives and from bakers and other citizens throughout the Nation.

My mail indicates that there is a widespread demand for such a study and for positive action on the potato-surplus problem. We cannot afford to let it run on and on. The problem is a perennial one now and it will get worse and worse if we do not take constructive steps. I submit that a plan such as I contemplate and as I have outlined is the logical next step for the Congress and for the Department of Agriculture to take. This plan has been endorsed by bakers, consumers and nutritionists—in fact, by every informed person who has taken the trouble to learn the details of the potato-surplus problem.

In conclusion, why talk about price reduction when we waste 100,000,000 bushels of potatoes, pay out \$80,000,000 in subsidies, ship out 500,000,000 bushels of grain, causing our own flour and bread prices to go up? If all surplus potatoes were processed into potato flour there would be no surpluses, no \$80,000,000 tax, no abnormally high-priced flour or bread and millions of people here and abroad would be better fed. And please remember, this problem will face us again and again year after year, unless we do something about it. I urge the Rules Committee to bring out my resolution providing for a thorough study of the potato-surplus problem.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For salaries and expenses, regular boundary activities, including examinations, preliminary surveys, and investigations, \$950,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the State Department appropriation language be considered as read and that amendments may be in order to any part thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary) including personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per diem; tele-type news service (not exceeding \$1,000); purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (not exceeding \$3,000); \$800,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 41, line 19, strike out "\$800,000" and insert "\$1,335,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the majority members of the Committee on Appropriations have recommended a cut of 40 percent in the budget of the Office of the Secretary in the Department of Commerce.

I want the House to consider this recommendation from the practical standpoint of efficiency.

I am confident that every Member of the House wants more efficiency in government. We all know that making adequate provisions for efficient administration is the only economical way to get any job done. Years of experience in both business and Government show that we can get efficiency only by providing for effective management. That is a simple principle that every successful business and every effective Government agency follows.

But despite charging the Office of the Secretary with at least three new management burdens, the majority members of this committee have recommended a drastic 40-percent slash in the appropriation for his office.

Let us look at the new responsibilities the committee demands that the Secretary's office fulfill with a 60-percent budget.

First. It wants the office to put more effort on the study of current business and industrial needs and to provide more suggestions about the types of legislation that will meet those needs.

Second. The committee wants more screening of the Department's publications and more coordination and consolidation in the publications program.

Third. The committee wants more time and effort spent on getting coordination between the Department of Commerce and other departments of the Government.

I subscribe to all of these suggestions. But these very important responsibilities can be carried out only in the Secretary's Office. Each one of them imposes an additional management burden on his staff. I want to point out that the recommended slash of 40 percent in the funds for the Secretary's Office would make it impossible for him to fulfill the

responsibilities the committee has assigned him. Gentlemen, let us be realistic. Even the most able craftsmen need tools. I think an ordinary sense of fairness must bring us to the conclusion that it is ridiculous to impose these additional responsibilities on the Secretary's Office and at the same time reduce his staff.

The committee has made another recommendation with respect to the Secretary's Office that is grossly inconsistent with our interest in efficient management. I think the suggestion that the Department's Central Services Pool be abolished and the work parcelled out to the various bureaus and offices would tend to defeat the Committee's avowed interest in economy. This central office which now handles personnel, printing, accounting and general office services for many offices of the Department was set up for the very purpose of avoiding duplication and confusion. It has resulted in considerable savings and in the very types of coordination that create the efficiencies and economies the Committee says it wants. To scatter this management function out among various bureaus and offices would require the employment of more people and encourage the confusion we all want to avoid. It would require the Department to spend more money on less efficient management.

The appropriations request of the Secretary, who is an experienced business man and administrator, has included less than one-half of 1 percent of his total budget for the management and supervisory services that are the very basis of efficiency and economy. To cripple the managing office of a department to which every business in the United States looks for efficient service would be penny wise and pound foolish. I urgently recommend that we give this able administrator the funds he needs to do the big job he has so ably started.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would increase the amount for the office of the Secretary of Commerce from \$800,000, as recommended by this committee, to \$1,335,000. The committee has gone into this matter very carefully and after a very, very serious study we feel that we have perhaps been a little more liberal than we should have been in reaching the amount of \$800,000.

This office in 1938 had \$478,000. In 1939 they had \$484,000. In 1940 they had \$617,000. In 1941 they went back to \$460,000. In 1942 they had \$557,000. In 1943 they had \$586,000. In 1945 they had \$689,000. In 1946 they had \$570,000, and after Mr. Wallace went into office and reorganized it, to \$925,000. Now, they are asking for \$1,335,000.

Let me tell you what they have in that office since Mr. Wallace went in there. They have a secretary, an under secretary, and an assistant secretary. They have an assistant to the secretary, and an executive assistant to the secretary. They have an executive assistant to the

under secretary, and an executive assistant to the assistant secretary. They have a secretary to the secretary and a secretary of public relations, and they have secretaries all over the place.

I think the committee has given them an ample amount of money to carry on the Department of Commerce in an orderly and effective way.

I suggest that the Committee vote this amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Technical and scientific services: For necessary expenses in the performance of activities and services relating to technological development as an aid to business in the development of foreign and domestic commerce, including all the objects for which the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, office of the Secretary," is available (not to exceed \$25,000), for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), and not to exceed \$60,000 for printing and binding, \$1,700,000, of which not to exceed \$500,000 may be transferred to the National Bureau of Standards for testing and other scientific studies.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I made a point of order against the language on lines 3 to 14, inclusive, on page 42 that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and not authorized by law.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Current census statistics: For expenses necessary for collecting, compiling, and publishing current census statistics provided for by law; temporary employees at rates to be fixed by the Director of the Census without regard to the Classification Act; the cost of obtaining State, municipal, and other records; preparation of monographs on census subjects and other work of specialized character by contract; purchase and rental of office furniture and equipment including mechanical and electrical tabulating equipment and other labor-saving devices; tabulating cards and continuous form tabulating paper; \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That on and after October 1, 1947, all functions necessary to the compilation of foreign trade statistics shall be performed in New York, N. Y., and of the foregoing amount \$1,200,000 shall be available exclusively for this purpose.

Mr. BEALL. I make a point of order against the language on page 43, line 18, beginning with the word "provided" and going through line 22 on the same page, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order and I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: On page 43, line 18, after the amount "\$5,000,000" and before the period, insert a comma and the words "of which amount not to exceed \$3,800,000 may be expended at the seat of government."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The Chairman. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Nebraska yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly in accord with the provisions of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. We had anticipated that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] would make the point of order with regard to the language in the paragraph we inserted on page 43 with reference to moving the Office of Foreign Trade Statistics to New York. The question of economy, which is paramount in the minds of all of us, plays an important part in this item.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. This is the place where it is very desirable from the standpoint of economy that the Bureau of the Census be not permitted to have 700 employees doing the work that 50 employees used to do in New York. I think the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is correct and proper.

Mr. ROONEY. However, I want to make myself perfectly clear that I am not in accord with the reduction made by the committee from \$11,500,000 to \$5,000,000 in the over-all figure for the collection of current census statistics. I was thoroughly in accord with the language on page 43 to which the point of order has been made by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. The funds there concern the collection of foreign-trade statistics, the office which does most of the work having been located in New York for a great many years. The committee held extensive hearings with regard to the situation and the New York office, and found that a saving of more than \$200,000 could be made by locating the entire outfit in New York.

Mr. STEFAN. It is \$250,000 that we are saving by this amendment. The gentleman might also add that we had investigators look into this matter several times and it was on the recommendation of these investigators that we have taken this action.

Mr. ROONEY. If I may conclude on the gentleman's time, the minority members of the subcommittee are in thorough accord with regard to the amendment now offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. I trust it will be adopted and the work of collecting foreign-trade statistics carried on in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] wish to make the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, this is an extremely important matter and one with which I believe the Members of the House are not familiar.

The facts are that at the present time there are approximately 300 employees in

Washington in this Foreign Trade Section of the Census Bureau and approximately 90 in New York. Now that the point or order to the removal proviso has been conceded this amendment is offered which in reality is a back-door attempt to move this Section to New York.

The Foreign Trade Section is but one minor department of the Census Bureau. In the Census Bureau there is the population census, the housing census, the manufacturing census, the employment census, the agricultural census not duplicated by the Agricultural Department, local and State governments census (relating to tax information of over 150,000 political units), and numerous others.

The pending bill reduced the current expenditure from \$10,000,000 to \$5,000,000. Of that \$5,000,000 this amendment would earmark nearly \$1,200,000, or allot approximately one-quarter of the total appropriation to the Foreign Trade Section alone and locate in New York against the judgment and wishes of the Commerce Department. The other phases of the work which I have mentioned would have to be administered with less than three-quarters of the appropriation but require about 10 times as many employees.

This Foreign Trade Section gets information from ships at ports all over the United States. Such information is sent by mail to Washington. New York is the only port in which they attempt to tabulate and publish the information themselves. Baltimore, ports on the Gulf and Pacific coasts, and other ports on the Atlantic coast send their information to Washington where it is tabulated and accessible.

The important thing in a census is not getting these reports from the ships, for the reports can be mailed in, as they are from every port except New York; the important phases of a census is the tabulating and dissemination, the publication of the information. At the bureau it is available to Congressmen, to other Government departments, to other branches of industry.

If this amendment prevails it will not only throw the allocation way out of balance, giving about one quarter of the total appropriation, to Foreign Trade Section, but in addition to that it will move the office which tabulates, disseminates and publishes the information to New York. Suppose this were permitted at every port and someone wanted to get information on the subject? Anyone desiring information regarding foreign trade port would have to get information about all the ports throughout the United States would have to contact each individual port. At the Census Bureau it is accessible. There it is tabulated and published.

My distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and the Chairman [Mr. TABER], naturally are for this amendment because they are both from New York.

It has not been called to the attention of the House that the Director of the Census and the Commerce Department are opposed to this removal. This matter has come up from time to time. A year ago the Bureau of the Budget was called upon to make a study of this



subject and prepared a report for the Appropriations Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. Chairman, a year ago when a study was made by the Bureau of the Budget for report to the Appropriations Committee, after extensive study they advised against it. They said:

The foreign trade statistics program cannot be merely a routine tabulation of the data contained in export and import documents. Its usefulness depends upon its adaptability to changing situations and needs. The program is not isolated, but closely related to working programs and responsibilities of many Government agencies.

The Section of Customs Statistics should be located in Washington from the standpoint of administration. If the offices were in Washington many problems could be adjusted from time to time before assuming large proportions requiring investigations. The location of the section in Washington would permit of a greater and more expeditious use of the basic data.

As it now stands, there are 300 employees here tabulating and disseminating and publishing information and if this amendment prevails they will be moved to New York where all that need be done is to take the data from the ships as is done in other ports by mail.

In addition to that, if I may repeat it again, it throws the appropriation way out of balance and earmarks over \$1,000,000 for this activity. If it is left here we will have the benefit of all the information.

These 300 families who would have to move to New York would not only have to give up their homes here, but would have difficulty in finding homes in that already overcrowded city. I hope the amendment will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired. Does the gentleman from Virginia press his point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY and Mr. SASSER) there were—ayes 71, noes 32.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: On page 43, line 18, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$11,500,000."

#### USE OF CENSUS FIGURES IN MAINTAINING STABLE ECONOMY

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I am certain there is one thing on which every Member of this House will agree. I think we would all agree that the chief responsibility of business, industry, and government today is to work together to insure a stable, high-level

economy for this Nation. If we were to be plunged again into a deep, morale-shattering depression, there are very real reasons to doubt that our form of government could survive as it now is, and as we want it to continue. There are some who are just lying in wait for that to happen.

We must do everything humanly possible to assist business and industry maintain high levels of employment and production. The people in my district and the people everywhere want to attain higher living standards and a greater measure of security that comes from full employment and a stable economy. With that in mind, I want to discuss what to me is one of the most shortsighted and uneconomic proposals I have ever seen. That is the proposal of the Appropriations Committee, in its recommendations on the budget of the Commerce Department, to cut the funds of the Bureau of the Census for current statistics from \$11,500,000 to \$5,000,000.

At this time in the Nation's history when it is imperative for all of us to make wise economic decisions, the Appropriations Committee proposes to reduce the main Government agency which provides Congress, business, industry, and agriculture with the facts and statistics upon which sound judgment and action can be based.

Full employment depends on high production and it takes shrewd, hard-headed managers, of large and small business alike, to maintain high production. They must know the right thing to do at the right time. Can this be expected of management unless up-to-date and accurate facts are available to them?

This need of business managers for facts, facts and more facts, is not something I have pulled out of a hat like a magician's rabbit. The urgent need of businessmen for information to guide them in intelligent management decisions is attested to by the strong position taken by the United States Chamber of Commerce and other business organizations in support of the fact-gathering work of the Bureau of the Census.

Business representatives point out that they must have these facts for intelligent planning. They want to have the most recent information available on current production and distribution, both retail and wholesale; they want to know the size of their markets, the size of the labor force, and latest figures on unemployment. These facts help them plan plant-expansion programs, how to schedule their purchases, their production, and their sales activities.

I said the information they need must be recent because in these days of rapid shifts information goes quickly out of date. It is therefore absolutely necessary that information be kept current, that old figures be replaced by new ones, so that decisions can keep pace with changes that are taking place.

Unless the funds we vote for the Census Bureau are adequate for its operation we will find that we here in Congress, businessmen, and farmers throughout the country will not have the basic facts and figures on which to operate their enterprises. This is a time when everyone is wondering whether a recession or a

depression is inevitable, and it is exactly the time when everyone should be well informed on all aspects of our Nation's economy.

I want to say again that it is our duty to maintain a stable economy. Our own welfare and that of the world depends on the steps we take in Congress to do this.

I believe that a reduction in the funds available to the Bureau of the Census is a step in the wrong direction. I ask the Members of the House to restore the funds to the \$11,500,000 which the Bureau requested. I think this is a step in the right direction and that it is one of the best investments this Congress can make in the welfare and prosperity of the Nation and the world.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would seek to increase the amount of \$5,000,000 allowed by committee for current census statistics to \$11,000,000. I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the Bureau of Census has taken unto itself unusually broad authority to take whatever census seems to come to their minds. Much of this, in our opinion, is not authorized or never was expected to be authorized by the Congress of the United States. I wish to call your attention to the fact that we have money in this bill for the decennial census—that is, to start the decennial census—which comes in 2 years, at which time practically all of this will be taken over again. We have information from various parts of the country indicating that the Census Bureau is now setting up field offices all over the United States, similar to the field offices of the Foreign and Domestic Commerce. A majority of the committee are of opinion that the amount that we allowed in this bill, \$5,000,000, is ample to carry on the current statistical work. We have allowed \$4,000,000 in this bill for the current census of manufactures. We see no reason, in view of the fact that the people want us to economize, why we should not reduce this sum to the amount we suggest, \$5,000,000. I call your attention to the fact, too, that in 1943 the amount for current census was \$1,242,000; in 1945, \$4,300,000; and in 1946, \$5,318,000. They are asking now \$11,500,000. I urge the members of the Committee for the sake of economy to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), incident to the enforcement of safety regulations; maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities and air-traffic control; furnishing advisory service to States and other public and private agencies in connection with the construction or improvement of airports and landing areas; including personal services in the District of Columbia; the operation and maintenance of 226 aircraft; contract stenographic

reporting services; fees and mileage of expert and other witnesses; purchase of 325 and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; and salaries and traveling expenses of employees detailed to attend courses of training conducted by the Government or other agencies serving aviation; \$66,133,000, and the War and Navy Departments are authorized to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Administration without charge aircraft, aircraft engines, parts, flight equipment, and hangar, line, and shop equipment surplus to the needs of such Departments: *Provided*, That none of the funds hereby appropriated shall be used for the employment of personnel for the operation of air-traffic control towers: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, and other public authorities for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of airport-traffic control towers.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 45, line 18, strike out "\$66,133,000" and insert "\$70,982,000"; and on page 45, line 23, strike out the proviso beginning with the word "That" and ending with the colon in line 1 on page 46.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this is the item in which I know a great many of us are vitally interested. This is the paragraph in the bill wherein the entire amount of moneys requested by the Civil Aeronautics Administration for airport traffic-control towers is eliminated. The majority members of this subcommittee and the majority members of the full Committee on Appropriations in their judgment cut out the amount \$4,849,000 for these very, very necessary airport traffic-control towers. My amendment would put the airport traffic-control tower program back in circulation. It would increase the amount on line 18, page 45, from \$66,133,000 to \$70,982,000, and also strike out the proviso beginning on line 23 on page 45 wherein the committee would like to have us say that none of the funds appropriated in the paragraph shall be used for the employment of personnel for the operation of air-traffic control towers.

I feel that I do not need to say very much with regard to this item because the temper of the House was expressed yesterday. I inserted at page 5196 of yesterday's RECORD a list of the airport traffic-control towers, numbering 148, showing the locations where those towers were intended to be. This is just another instance of penny-wise, pound-foolish economy on the part of the majority. They eliminate 148 of these traffic-control towers with the expectation, the hope, and the prayer that somebody else will pay for them, when the fact of the matter is they are thereby jeopardizing safety on our entire system of national airways.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. What was the expenditure for this service last year?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not have that figure readily available.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will yield, we had an amount last year for 130

towers. They are asking for 18 more this year. It was about \$3,000,000 last year.

Mr. ROONEY. I trust you will support the amendment I have offered, which would, as I said before, put back into circulation our airport tower control program.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This committee eliminated \$4,849,000 for the air-traffic-control towers because the membership is convinced now, more than ever, that these towers should be operated by the cities and municipalities in which the airports are located and who derived the benefit from the traffic of the airports. The commercial air lines, the nonscheduled air lines, and private fliers should participate in this cost. Last year, the funds for these towers were restored on the floor of the House for the same arguments being presented today. I supported the amendment last year, feeling that we should take care of the most important towers temporarily as a stopgap. Before the war, the control-tower operators were paid for by the municipalities. Many of them used CAA operators. The Army then took over the operations of the air-control towers, and when the war was over, the Army stated they no longer needed the towers for the prosecution of the war and they returned them to the municipalities. It was thought at that time that it would be well to continue operating some of the most important towers under Government expense for about a year, in order to give the municipalities, the air lines, and the CAA an opportunity to arrange for a method of paying for these operators out of private funds. The committee felt that, as long as the Government is constructing most of the airports furnishing most of the equipment and safety aids, it should not be called upon to pay for the salaries of the operators of the air-control towers any more than it should be called upon to pay for the railroad operators and train dispatchers in the railroad depots. A majority of the committee feels that with a transfer of the costs of operating these towers the safety factor is in no way affected. The towers would be continued to be operated by CAA personnel under CAA standards and the cities and municipalities would merely be reimbursed \$25,000 or \$35,000 each annually for the operation of the towers. The actual maintenance of these towers, that is, installing equipment and keeping it in first-class condition, would continue to be a responsibility of the CAA and funds are provided in this bill for that purpose.

It is my sincere belief that if something is not done, or started very soon, this item will eventually cost the taxpayers more than \$150,000,000 a year and the present amount will be increased every year, or as rapidly as the real pressure can be placed on the CAA by the hundreds of cities which want the government to pay for this service and which they are paying for themselves without complaint. These municipalities and their officers tell me, "We are paying for the operators in our towers ourselves and we are willing to do that if the rest of the cities in

the United States are given the same treatment; but if you are going to pay for the operators in the control towers of 130 cities, we want the same advantage and do not want to be discriminated against." So the committee felt that in view of this hodge-podge program which now has gotten into the category of "pork barrel" we should call it to the attention of Congress by eliminating the item, so far as the payment of salaries to the operators is concerned, and leave in all of the safety factors.

I know how difficult it is for Members of Congress to make their decision on this amendment, because every Member who has a control tower in his town and district being paid for by the Federal Government has a score of telegrams in his possession demanding that he work to restore this money into this bill. Also, a large number of Members who have air control towers in their towns or districts, being paid for by municipalities, have telegrams and letters in their possession from the mayors and other officials demanding to get in on the band wagon.

Those of you who believe in economy and recognize the financial condition of the Federal Treasury should hesitate before you cast your vote in favor of this amendment. The amendment should be defeated in order to give the Interstate Commerce Committee notice that we want some legislation in order to safeguard our Treasury and bring about a badly needed review of the entire financial conditions of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and its relationship to the American taxpayer and the aviation industry generally.

I want to repeat what I told the members of the committee yesterday in my general statement regarding my concern over the matter of cost, and the predictions which are made every day connected with the air industry. This refers to the great increases in the number of airplanes and personnel and the air industry generally that affect the future. I might point out that the number of domestic civil aircraft produced in 1941 was a little over 8,000. It is estimated 50,000 will be produced in 1948. The total registered aircraft in 1941 was 22,500, and it is estimated 171,000 will be produced in 1948. The total revenue passenger-miles in 1938 was 1,300,000,000, and it is estimated that in 1948 the total revenue passenger-miles will be 7,500,000,000. It seems obvious that the Federal Government cannot afford to continue to increase appropriations to the CAA in proportion to the increased air activity.

It would be very well for Members of Congress to inform themselves what it cost the taxpayer every time a commercial airplane leaves an airport with a load of passengers and freight. It is time to review this entire matter of cost.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Does the committee understand that we have 4,700 airports now in the United States?

Mr. STEFAN. We have 4,728 airports in the United States.

Mr. DONDERO. That means we have 100 airports for every State in the Union.



Mr. STEFAN. Besides that, the Army and Navy turned over to us by way of surplus more than 400 surplus airports which were built for war purposes. They told us in committee they will have in addition to that many more surplus Army and Navy airports for which they will have no further use.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Is not the gentleman and the committee aware that this air transportation is increasing by leaps and bounds and that it would be manifestly unfair to unload the cost of maintaining these towers on the local governments?

Mr. STEFAN. I am aware of that more than you are because I have lived with this thing for more than 15 years. I know about it. Certainly I am aware of it. I am just as interested in the safety factor as you or anybody else. That is what I am going to talk about. We cannot discriminate on safety. If one airport gets the service, why should not other airports get the service?

Mr. SABATH. But the elimination of this appropriation will not help for the safety for our air travelers.

Mr. STEFAN. I will get into that and explain it.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. Is it not true that we are at the place where we have to make a decision? Either we have to cut out the control towers or we have to furnish control towers and operate them for every airport.

Mr. STEFAN. Absolutely. Somewhere along the line you have got to make a start, and here it is.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do not the fares which are charged passengers for traveling in these planes cover a substantial gross cost so that the air lines can pay for some of these improvements?

Mr. STEFAN. The argument will be made that they do not and that the commercial lines are not making money now.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut for the Rooney amendment: On page 45, line 18, strike out "66,133" and insert "\$70,983."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, this matter was pretty well

discussed on yesterday. I want to explain the difference between the substitute amendment and the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The gentleman from New York suggests that we strike out the proviso at the end of the section which permits the CAA to receive reimbursements from States, counties, and municipalities. I believe that should be left in the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. That is not it at all.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Did not the gentleman ask that that proviso be stricken out?

Mr. ROONEY. The only proviso that I asked be stricken out was the proviso which stated that none of the funds hereby appropriated shall be used for the employment of personnel for the operation of air traffic control towers.

The gentleman's amendment does not even include that. So while the gentleman asks for the same amount as I do, except an additional thousand dollars, more or less, he does not provide that the airport traffic control towers may be maintained.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I beg the gentleman's pardon and the pardon of the Committee. I had the wrong proviso in mind. The proviso I had in mind was at the top of page 46.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the substitute amendment and that I may be recognized on the Rooney amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Briefly.

Mr. BROOKS. I assume from what the gentleman said that he is very much in favor of increasing the appropriations.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am absolutely in agreement with the gentleman from New York in restoring the full amount.

Mr. BROOKS. I am very glad to learn that and I assure the gentleman that I think he is right.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Our distinguished friend from Nebraska made the statement that the only reason we favored this was because we got telegrams from mayors and so forth. Is that the reason the gentleman favors it?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I have not received a single telegram from any mayor in my district. There are only two control towers in my district. To me this is a matter of making our airways safe and nothing more.

I usually agree with the gentleman from Nebraska. As I said on yesterday, I agree with the gentleman from Nebraska in the ultimate plan of eventually turning the cost of these control-tower operations back to the States. I believe, however, that should be done only after the Congress has considered legislation

whereby we can set up a plan and determine who is going to pay for a lot of this airway equipment. I think the day will soon be here when the air lines should pay a greater share of the cost of the air-line equipment; but I do think it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide the equipment to operate what we usually refer to as our Federal airways system.

The gentleman from Nebraska stated that there were 4,000 or more airports in the United States. Nobody is even asking that we put a federally-operated control tower at every one of those airports.

This expensive CAA program has grown considerably in the past few years and it is going to grow in the future, but so have the revenues. I want to refer to a paragraph of the testimony presented to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee this morning bearing on this subject of revenues from air lines and air-line operations. Mr. Carlton Putnam, president, Chicago & Southern Air Lines, Inc., testified:

Under an estimate made for Congress by the Board of Investigation and Research, the domestic air lines thus far have received in the way of mail subsidy about \$110,000,000. This appears to have been pretty well paid back, since the direct expenditure from appropriations in the domestic air-mail service by the Post Office Department, including both the payments to carriers and all the other direct costs of maintaining the service, but not indirect allocations, was \$361,436,839 through 1946, whereas the postal revenue was \$484,071,259, leaving a credit in the air lines' favor on this basis of \$122,634,420. This exceeds by more than \$32,000,000 the \$90,000,000 estimated by the Civil Aeronautics Board to be the air lines' share of the costs of airways and airports. So we have a total of perhaps \$200,000,000 (the \$110,000,000 plus the \$90,000,000) so far advanced by the Government, in the form of support, with accruals back to the Government of all of this, plus the Post Office's direct allocations, plus \$32,000,000.

A great deal of this maintenance cost for airways is coming back to the Treasury through the Post Office Department.

Mr. Wright, of the CAA, testified when this matter was under consideration by the subcommittee, as follows:

Mr. WRIGHT. We feel that the airport traffic-control towers are a vital and integral part of the Federal airways system, and it would be absolutely inappropriate. With the increasing traffic that there is it would possibly be disastrous to have those operated by local communities.

Again he said:

Mr. WRIGHT. If you are talking of the reimbursement to the Government of one part of the expense, such as we are talking about under this general Federal airways program, that would be a possibility, if you could get all the cities to do it, but if one refused to do it, it seems to me you would be left without one link in your whole Federal airways system, and you simply could not fly airplanes into that airport under instrument weather conditions.

Mr. Chairman, there is the best authority I know of on the operation of the American airways.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. How much does the gentleman's amendment increase this

appropriation for the maintenance of these airways?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. A little less than \$5,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the Rooney amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW for the amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 45, line 18, strike out "\$66,133,000" and insert "\$70,848,500", and strike out the proviso beginning on line 23, page 45, and ending on line 1, page 46.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the difference between the Rooney amendment and my amendment is the deduction of \$133,500 which I find upon reading the hearings and the committee report was allocated and assigned to the Washington National Airport and included in the Washington National Airport appropriation for the purpose of maintaining the control-tower operation here in Washington. Consequently, it is not needed as a part of this over-all appropriation, and I have deducted it from the total amount.

In respect to control tower operation, I think that I am as well qualified to speak on this subject as nearly any Member of the House, having been a member of the investigating committee of which the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Nichols, was chairman, and which included the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Kleberg, and the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Pearson. The first time that we came to the full conclusion that control towers definitely should be operated by the Federal Government was upon the investigation of the accident that occurred at Atlanta, Ga., wherein our former colleague, Bill Byron, was killed, and Eddie Rickenbacker was seriously injured. We came to the conclusion then and there that to trust the municipality for the quality of operators, with the salary scales offered by some municipalities and with the patronage system involved, was a wholly unsatisfactory way to operate such an important part of our airway system. If you will examine the accident statistics over the years you will find that a very high proportion—the exact proportion is not in my mind at the moment, but it is in my mind as 80 percent—of all accidents to aircraft, both civil, military, and commercial, occur on or in the immediately vicinity of airports when the airplanes are under control of the local control zone operator or the airport control-tower operator. Consequently, it is of the very highest importance that these control-tower operators be just top notch.

Now, to say that you are going to turn this function back to the municipalities on June 30 next and expect them to support the operation of control towers is, in my humble opinion, perfectly ridiculous. The local communities are not in a position to take over these control towers on the 30th of next June, and if they were, there are many of them that

would not be able to afford to do it, because while they might be an important airport for either air line flying or private flying or military flying, they might be small municipalities, and hence be unable to support a control tower. My committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, having the subject of air safety under investigation and study since the 15th of January of this year, is now giving very careful thought to many matters relating to aviation, and this is one of them. Whether or not we will be able to resolve an equitable solution to this problem any different than the one now being used, is a question which we cannot answer as yet. It is entirely too complicated.

There are airports which are used principally by Army and Navy fliers. There are airports which are principally used by the private fliers flying small airplanes. There are airports such as LaGuardia and Washington National that are used very largely and almost exclusively by commercial operators. Landing fees are charged to commercial operators, of course, but there is only one airport in the United States that is even breaking even today—I guess Washington National is coming close to it—but LaGuardia Airport, I understand, shows a small profit. No other airport in the United States is able to show a profit on its operations as yet. However, the business is growing, and it may be that in the not too distant future some will be able to show a profit on their airports. However, they are not presently able to support the quality of control-tower operators and the number of control-tower operators that are required to bring safety to aviation.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Was it not brought out before our committee that if this GCA equipment is operated, as they hope to by the control-tower operators, that it will make them even a more essential part of the control-tower operation?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is right. A console with two radar scopes can be used very handily by the control-tower operators themselves, and much to my surprise, in the Washington National Airport budget, they put in \$69,000 for additional personnel to operate the radar scope.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. There is no need whatever, as I see it, to supply additional operators at control towers for the operation of these radar scopes. I understand however, that very large sums of money were suggested by the CAA for that purpose.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman stated at the outset that his substitute amendment was similar to mine except for the amount of \$133,500 for the Washington National Airport. Does the gentleman realize that on page 47 of the bill under "Maintenance and operation, Washington National Airport," the amount of \$133,500 to which he refers is included?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is exactly why I deducted it from the over-all item, because it is included in the Washington National Airport item according to your committee report and hence is not needed as a part of the over-all amount.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is utterly incorrect. I am sure the chairman of the subcommittee on his side will explain it to him.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I ask the chairman of the committee if I am not correct in that statement?

Mr. STEFAN. The item was deducted in the committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Deducted from what?

Mr. STEFAN. It has been deducted from the amount w. allowed. If the gentleman will read the third paragraph on page 27 of the committee report, he will find that we deducted this \$133,500 for the maintenance and operation of air control tower, Washington Airport, from the item the gentleman seeks to decrease on page 45, line 18, namely, \$66,133,000.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman means that the amount of \$4,890,000, or whatever it is, was originally \$133,500 higher than that?

Mr. STEFAN. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. Then I am wrong, but the bill and the committee report are quite indefinite on that point. Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my substitute amendment, with the hope that the Rooney amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to read to the House two telegrams which I have received from officials of the city and county of San Francisco. The first is from Hon. Roger Lapham, mayor of San Francisco. I quote:

Am advised House Appropriations Committee has eliminated from Commerce Department appropriation bill funds for operation of San Francisco airport air-traffic-control tower. While we naturally protest imposition of this financial burden on our local government, we are more principally concerned because of firm feeling that all traffic-control-tower men should be hired and controlled by one agency, necessarily Federal, in the interest of uniform control in all airports and resulting standardization of safety for benefit of all pilots as well as passengers. It is unthinkable that national and international air commerce and lives of countless thousands of passengers should be jeopardized.

I personally oppose centralization of government in Federal hands as a matter of



broad principle, but feel that air commerce, which knows no State boundaries and few international ones, is type of operation so fast moving and broad that centralization in Federal agency of safety control and supervision is only answer in this particular case.

San Francisco now spending \$20,000,000 to make our airport one of world's finest. Many other cities also modernizing airports for safety and convenience. All this would be undermined if uniform safety standards of air-traffic-control-tower men are sidetracked by Federal Government.

ROGER D. LAPHAM,  
Mayor.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote a telegram which I have received from Mr. Mike Doolin, manager of the San Francisco Airport, who is in attendance at the convention of the American Association of Airport Executives in Chicago. I quote:

The American Association of Airport Executives in annual convention at Chicago and as a special first order of business request that you present to the Congress immediately its unanimous and urgent protest against the elimination from CAA appropriations of funds for the operation of air traffic control towers. This association, composed of airport managers and executives of wide experience in aviation, and from localities with the heaviest volume of air traffic, are amazed at the elimination of funds for this key agency on which is dependent the safety of air commerce and the life of every pilot and air passenger on air line or any other aircraft.

Congress must reinstate funds for the Federal operations of air traffic control towers or take the responsibility for the complete break-down of a system of flight control which has been proven the safest in the world.

MIKE DOOLIN,  
Manager, San Francisco Airport.

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. BAKEWELL for the Rooney amendment.

Page 45, line 18, strike out "\$66,133,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$71,045,734."

On page 45, line 23, strike out beginning with the word "That", down to and including the word "towers", on page 46, line 1, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That \$4,877,734 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be available for the employment of personnel for the operation of air-traffic control towers."

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Chairman, the objective of this amendment is substantially the same as the objective of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York. However, it goes a little bit further than his.

His amendment eliminates lines 23, 24, and 25, which provide that these funds should not be used for the personnel handling air-control towers. My amendment goes further and affirmatively states that these funds, if they should be reinstated, shall specifically be used for this purpose. My amendment likewise increases the amount from \$4,849,000 to \$4,877,000, in order to include within this program an airport which was approved and recognized by the CAA after it had submitted its figures to the Committee on Appropriations.

As we all know, the primary responsibility for the safety of the airways is lodged in the Civil Aeronautics Authority. To attempt to return that function to the communities, would in my judgment be inviting confusion, lack of uniformity, and possibly disaster. The CAA has very high standards and qualifications for its personnel. It has an established and uniform system throughout the country. It means a great deal to every Army, Navy, commercial, and private pilot who comes into an airport if he is accustomed to the system of communications which is in operation there. There is now perfect cooperation between land and air which must be maintained, particularly when we consider the split-second decisions which frequently must be made in bringing a plane in for landing at a crowded airport or controlling traffic for take-off.

What is the cost of this program? I believe in economy. This program is less than \$5,000,000. Yet, if you have one disaster involving a DC-6 you will have lost almost a million dollars right there. Of course, we would not attempt to evaluate in dollars and cents the human lives, and on these large passenger ships there can be 40, 50, or 60 people.

The committee recommends that the CAA personnel still operate these airports, but that the city should reimburse them.

With due deference to this recommendation of the committee, I do not think that it is realistic. There will be a division of responsibility. You will have these flight-control tower operators in the impossible position of trying to serve two masters; that is, the CAA, by whose regulations they must abide, and the municipalities, who are paying their salaries.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKEWELL. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. PLOESER. I would like to say to my colleague from Missouri that I support wholeheartedly the idea that this should be under Federal supervision, and I will support not only his substitute but I would support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. However, I do believe that with the tremendous growth of this cost to the Federal Government, an immediate plan should be brought about whereby we will have local reimbursement. I do not believe we should go on and on and on and let these costs mount when in the main they are to the credit and the additional service of the air lines and the municipalities. I support it in the hope that this Congress can bring a program which will reimburse the Federal Government for the management of airport controls.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKEWELL. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman please advise the amount that he inserted in line 18 in lieu of \$66,130,000?

Mr. BAKEWELL. \$71,045,734.

Mr. ROONEY. May I inquire of the gentleman how he arrived at that figure?

Mr. BAKEWELL. This figure includes the \$4,849,000 which was cut by the Appropriations Committee together with the sum of \$63,734 submitted by the CAA as the cost of devices and personnel required for the operation of an airport which was recently approved by it, that is, after the CAA had submitted its original estimates to the Appropriations Committee. In that regard I should like to defer to my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE], in whose district this recently approved airport is situated.

Mr. ROONEY. I think there are a number of gentlemen who have local airports they would like to have included.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder if the gentleman would advise me as to how he arrived at that amount.

Mr. BAKEWELL. I defer to my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE], in whose district this particular airport is located.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield, I hope to get time after the gentleman has yielded the floor. However, I will say that the CAA furnished me the figure of \$63,734 for the operation of the control tower and the replacing of equipment there at St. Joseph, Mo.

Mr. ROONEY. I believe the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT] also has an airport down in New Orleans that the CAA gave him some figures with regard to a new project. Does the gentleman from Missouri realize that these items have not been presented by the Bureau of the Budget; that they have not been examined by this committee and by the able chairman the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], and the majority members of the committee, and that the figure which he suggests is one that is more or less taken out of thin air?

Mr. BAKEWELL. I yielded to the gentleman for a question, and now if I may answer him: In the first place I do not think that the CAA merely takes its figures out of thin air. As far as I am concerned, I think every airport that is under the supervision of the CAA should have this same type of operation. I would have gladly acceded to the request of any Member of this Congress in whose district an airport might recently have been approved but for which funds were not allocated in this bill. And now to include the airport for which the request is made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE], is just extending my theory that you must have uniformity in every airport throughout the country.

We witnessed a series of air casualties last winter. The Congress initiated an investigation. Suppose we deny the CAA these funds, and some crashes occur as a result. Suppose, further, that the Congress undertakes an investiga-

tion, and comes to the conclusion that the crashes were due to untrained and inexperienced flight-control operators. Then the Congress will stand self-accused and self-convicted before the entire country.

I appeal to you, my colleagues, to restore these funds. Aviation is peculiarly interstate and national in scope, more so than any other medium of travel. To turn this responsibility back to the local communities would definitely be a step backward in the development and progress of aviation. There must be uniformity in the operation of air-control towers. To deny these funds to the CAA is tinkering with safety and toying with human life which we cannot afford to do when we consider the comparatively minor sum involved.

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter received from Gen. Milton W. Arnold, vice president, in charge of operations and engineering of the Air Transportation Association of America, and also a copy of a telegram received from Mr. David L. Behncke, president, Air Line Pilots Association:

AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,  
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1947.  
The Honorable CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL,  
Congressman from Missouri,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

My DEAR CONGRESSMAN BAKEWELL: I thought you might be interested in the thoughts of the Air Transport Association concerning the proposal of the House Appropriations Committee to eliminate Civil Aeronautics Administration operation of airport control towers.

The scheduled air-line industry is greatly concerned respecting the possible decrease in safety that would occur should the important function of airport traffic control, with the accompanying responsibility of approach control under instrument approach conditions, be assigned to air traffic controllers who were employees either directly or indirectly of any agency or organization other than the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

It has been agreed by all Government agencies concerned with the operation of aircraft, as well as representatives of all segments of civil aircraft operations, that airport and airway traffic control are no longer separate and distinct functions and must, in the interests of safe and reliable aircraft operations, function completely under the supervision and the control of one agency.

As you are aware, the Civil Aeronautics Administration has adopted a policy of approving approach control only at those airports where airport traffic control is under its jurisdiction and the tower operators in its employ. The air lines concur wholeheartedly with this stand.

There have been several cases in the past where approach control has not functioned to the best interest of safe aircraft operations where control tower operators were employed by the municipalities. I believe outstanding examples that can be cited are La Guardia Field and the Detroit city airport, the towers at both of which have subsequently been placed under the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

With an ever-increasing utilization of airway and airport facilities, and the installation of improved navigational aids at airports, designed to permit speedier and more reliable instrument approaches, it seems more important than ever that everything be

done that will provide the maximum amount of safety in all aspects of air traffic control.

The committee has recommended that the airport control tower operators be retained in the employ of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the individual cities reimburse the Civil Aeronautics Administration for salaries which supposedly would allow standardization. There is no law nor requirement to force the cities to take such action. Furthermore, if a number of key cities fail to accept this responsibility the entire system of traffic control is broken and safety is greatly jeopardized. This type of arrangement will necessarily require airport traffic controllers to serve two agencies; namely, the individual cities and the Federal Government which will not be conducive to efficient and safe operations.

For your information, we are attaching a condensation of the reasons that the air-line industry feels that the Civil Aeronautics Administration should operate airport traffic control towers. This material has been supplied to the Bureau of the Budget and the agencies interested in the matter, which have requested that the Air Transport Association provide this data for their guidance in considering this question.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON W. ARNOLD,  
Vice President, Operations and Engineering.

#### REASONS FOR CAA OPERATION OF CONTROL TOWERS

1. Standardization of training of controllers has been reached through CAA training courses.

2. Procedures and phraseologies have been standardized.

3. Technical advances in equipment design more readily possible.

4. Purchase of equipment incorporating latest design features possible under Federal operation of control towers because of greater resources and purchasing power of the CAA at a saving to the taxpayer.

5. Approach control, a necessity to more reliable and safe clearance of aircraft into and out of airports under restricted conditions of ceiling and visibility, can only function when both airport tower personnel and airway traffic personnel are responsible to the same central authority.

6. Maintenance of tower-operating equipment such as radio transmitters and receivers, voice recorders, interphone circuits, etc., more economically and efficiently accomplished by technical specialists employed by the CAA.

7. Competent tower-operating personnel essential to the safety of air commerce more readily accessible to the CAA than through municipal sources because of CAA ability to reach by means of Federal civil service all corners of the country. Opportunities for advancement will be greater because under the CAA particularly competent personnel may be promoted to better positions at other towers.

8. Air traffic now using, and which will continue to use, the airways consist of Army and Navy aircraft, air-carrier planes, miscellaneous aircraft, privately owned aircraft, and planes of foreign registry. Owing to the widespread diversification of interest of operators of the various types of aircraft it is essential to orderly and safe operational procedures that airport-traffic control be exercised by an authoritative Federal agency.

9. The practice of permitting airport-tower personnel to make official visibility observations under conditions of variable visibility for transmission to pilots of aircraft approaching the airport for landings is only authorized for tower operators employed by the CAA. This service is of great importance in that the pilot receives instantly any visibility information that may affect the safety of his approach procedure.

10. A large proportion of airport traffic is interstate or international rather than local and the responsibility of controlling this traffic should not be placed upon the municipality.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 10, 1947.

HON. CLAUDE I. BAKEWELL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:

Word has reached me that there is language in H. R. 3311, page 45, and elsewhere in this measure, that strike out \$4,849,000 which will have the effect of discontinuing all present Federal air traffic control tower operators. Under this plan replacements can come only from local municipalities improperly trained, ill-equipped political appointees. The Nation's air line pilots object most strenuously to this deletion of funds from H. R. 3311 on the grounds that it will have the effect of causing the harmful disintegration of the present Nation-wide uniform air traffic control operation procedure which is marked advance in air traffic control methods. The presently employed air traffic controllers, methods, and procedures are the results of years of trial and error, careful selection, and expert training. To destroy all this and throw it into the hands of local municipalities where these jobs will become political footballs and will be used for local patronage purposes dependent on who happens to have the upper hand politically at the time and changing with each changing political regime, will result in a disastrous backward step in the development of our air line network so important to our air commerce and to national defense. Air line traffic and air traffic control from one end to the other still has a long way to go to reach perfection but if the parts of it that have reached reasonably safe and practical development are destroyed by foolish economy then we are turning our backs upon what is right and proper and inviting an epidemic of air crashes and marching backwards to the dark ages of air line traffic control. I am sure that the Congress of the United States would not want to do this and upon knowing the facts will wisely restore the money that they have struck from H. R. 3311 for the payment of the presently employed highly experienced and efficient air traffic control tower operators in preference to the hodge podge of political appointees to control our air traffic. The air line pilots of our Nation will deeply appreciate a reconsideration of this action by the Congress of the United States, many of whose Members they fly as passengers to and from their districts. To not restore these funds would be calamitous to the best interests of our country's air lines and to the defense of our Nation.

DAVID L. BEHNCKE,  
President, Air Line Pilots Association.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3311, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.



Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix on two subjects and to include two resolutions.

Mr. BAKEWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein a letter and a telegram.

Mr. KING (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California) asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address given by the Vice President of the Philippines at the Press Club on yesterday.

#### HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we will meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow and take up first the conference report on the Greek-Turkish aid bill.

We will then continue the consideration of the State, Commerce, Justice bill, which I trust can be disposed of expeditiously.

The bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency will then be considered and if it is disposed of, and barring some unforeseen development, we expect to adjourn over from tomorrow afternoon until Monday.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be excused for tomorrow on account of personal and important reasons.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

#### SECURITY PROBLEMS IN THE ATOMIC AGE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, with the recent passage of the Greek-Turkish loan, the United States is embarked on a far-reaching and radically different foreign policy.

Many of the people who are fairly well-informed about the atomic-energy development, look with great concern on the steadily deteriorating relations with Russia. Many of us who are neither pro-Russian nor pro-isolationist reserve the right to be pro-American in the best sense of the term without becoming anti-humanitarian.

It is because of my deep interest in conveying to the people of my district and the Nation some very pertinent thinking on the implications of the atomic-energy discovery—that I have asked for this time to read into the RECORD a startling, brilliant, and challenging address which was recently given by one of our brilliant young scientists, Mr. Cord Meyer, Jr.

Mr. Meyer, in the latter part of his address makes an analysis of the Baruch plan and makes certain conclusions with which I am not wholly in accord. However, his arguments are strong and worthy of serious consideration. I confess that I am not able to completely refute them with the knowledge I now have. With his suggestion that we approach control of the atom by strengthening the United Nations in the direction of world government on the security plane, I am in complete accord.

Mr. Meyer's address follows:

I hardly need to remind you here who are close to events in the National Capital of the crisis in foreign relations which our Government now faces. It is impossible to exaggerate the fatal significance of the decisions that America cannot avoid making in the immediate future. Whether our fate is to be peace or an atomic-biological war is the issue. I do not overstate the case when I say that the lives of more than one-third of humanity and the survival of what we have chosen to call civilization are at stake. Let me describe briefly the three basic alternatives before us.

The first alternative is to attempt to insure our national security by remaining the strongest military power in the world. Although there is no effective defense against an atomic attack once it is launched, we can try to prevent a would-be aggressor from ever beginning such an attack by the obvious size and efficiency of our preparations for a counteroffensive. By building up our capacity to retaliate even though our cities lie in ruins and half our people are killed, we can hope to instill such fear into other governments that they will never dare to risk war with us. This is the policy of peace through intimidation into which our Government is rapidly drifting.

If we adopt this alternative, other nations have no choice but to do likewise. When superior military power is the sole guaranty of national security, each government is forced to compete for that superiority. Every increase in our armed strength will provoke a corresponding increase in the power of others. A mounting competition for arms, allies, strategic bases, and raw materials is the inevitable result. Our only possible competitor in this struggle is the Soviet Union, which alone has the potential strength to challenge our lead. Quite

apart from ideological considerations, the United States and the Soviet Union are doomed to be the two central contestants, because in the search for national security each is the only real threat to the other.

Before we are finally and irrevocably committed to this meaningless struggle there is still time to consider the consequences. We cannot insure our ability to strike back after the holocaust of a modern assault merely by building more atomic bombs, biological weapons, bombers, and rockets than our possible opponent. That nation which is able to protect from atomic bombing vital sections of its industry and population by subterranean dispersal will enjoy a decisive advantage in any future war. If we seek protection in our ability to retaliate, we have no time whatever to lose in building secret and self-sufficient underground production centers. Our present concentration of men and machines in a few congested cities makes us the most vulnerable target in the world. There is also need for a large professional standing army equipped with the most effective modern weapons, widely dispersed, and kept in instant readiness to launch the counter-offensive. As far as possible our urban population must be protected by underground shelters. The concentration of the entire directing personnel of the Government in Washington can no longer be tolerated.

This is the minimum price of modern preparedness. It can only be paid by profound changes in our political and economic system. The necessary dispersion of industry can only be accomplished by autocratic planning and Government edict. Labor will have to be conscripted to work in the underground factories. As the stock piles of weapons grow our living standards will decline. Antisabotage and espionage precautions will restrict and finally eliminate our civil liberties. In foreign policy, the search for allies will lead us into backing any regime, no matter how corrupt and tyrannical, so long as it opposes Russia. In attempting to defend the independence of our country by military power in this new age, we will have to give up all that has made it worth defending in the past. When the last measure of preparedness has been completed and the state has become one vast military machine poised for instantaneous retaliation, we will be a driven and degraded people and life for the individual will be a drawn-out agony of oppression and suspense.

Will these sacrifices accomplish their purpose? Can war be prevented by fear of our armed power? I do not believe so. As the nations accumulate the weapons with which they can annihilate each other's cities suspicions will grow monstrous. Already as the struggle for power increases between the United States and Russia each Government protests that its own preparations are purely defensive, but each suspects that the other plots aggression. Now that the only defense is a counter offensive, there is no longer any way of distinguishing between defensive and aggressive preparations, until the last moment when the attack is launched. Sooner or later fear will provoke war, and one nation or the other will strike first in order to deny the advantage of the initiative to its opponent. Peace cannot be built on mutual terror. In the war that will inevitably result from competing programs of preparedness industrial society will be totally destroyed.

The second alternative is the preventive war. The difficulties and dangers of a prolonged competition for military supremacy with Russia have led some to the conclusion that we should attack now while we have the atomic bomb and they don't. Life magazine has recently condensed for mass consumption James Burnham's vision of an American empire established and maintained by nuclear fission. There are demands in

the Congress for an immediate show-down with Russia. Because the body of opinion that believes in the preventive war is growing with remarkable speed the argument is worth refuting. Morally, preventive war is a nice name for aggression. The unsubstantial suspicion that our victim planned to attack at some future date could not mitigate our guilt. Preventive war is the act for which we hung the Nazi leaders at Nuremberg. Practically, the preventive war is not as easy as it has been made to appear by its supporters. It would not end with the atomization of Moscow and Leningrad. The Red Army would march into western Europe, the Middle East, and China. They would have many allies, as our attack would alienate even our own friends. The resulting land campaign would be long and incredibly costly. England and Europe would be ruined beyond repair. If the Russians do not yet have atomic bombs it is quite probable that they are already armed with the means of biological warfare. Should we attack them they would be justified in striking back with incurable epidemics that might eliminate whole sections of our population. Eventually we might be able to win a shadow victory. We would then be forced to establish an iron tyranny over the entire earth in order to prevent the defeated from constructing modern weapons for revenge. Nor can the spread of communism be stopped by killing large numbers of those who believe in it. Past attempts to crush militant faiths by the sword have been singularly unsuccessful.

Who would fight this preventive war for those who seek to provoke it? I believe that there are many who fought bravely and well in the last war to defend their country who would prefer jail to the role of aggressors. Preventive war is a nightmare that we must reject.

There is a third alternative: It is the policy of attempting to find with the Soviet Union and the other nations a cooperative solution of the security problem. Good-will gestures of unilateral disarmament are futile and dangerous. But we must offer to join with others in transforming an impotent United Nations into a reliable system of international security while preserving our national armed strength until general agreement to the new system is obtained. Once it is recognized that no amount of sacrifice for armaments can delay war for long or protect the country when war comes, it is clear that we have a right and a duty to demand that the first objective of the United States Government be the establishment of an effective international organization for our protection.

What has the United States Government done to date in order to strengthen the United Nations and to halt the suicidal arms race that has already begun? It has proposed the Baruch plan, and many think that in doing so we have fulfilled our obligation as the first country to develop and use atomic weapons. The feeling is general that we have done all within our power to assure peace. Now, it is argued, the other nations, and particularly Russia, must accept the Baruch plan or, by refusing it, convict themselves of intent to commit aggression. Whether this view is accurate can only be shown by a critical analysis of the Baruch plan itself.

As you know, the plan calls for an abolition of atomic weapons. Inspection and an international monopoly on the potentially dangerous peacetime uses of atomic energy are to insure that bombs cannot be secretly constructed by any government. Only by expropriating the plants of the international authority would a nation be able to manufacture bombs, and this seizure would be immediately evident to the world. All other nations acting through the Security Council are then to join forces against the violator, which would not retain its veto to prevent

collective action. In other words, if and when the Baruch plan is put into effect, the danger of sudden and surprise attack with atom bombs will be eliminated, since no nation will have them. Any attempt to make bombs is to be discovered by an international intelligence service, and all governments can then seize the atomic plants in their respective territories and join in the race to make the first bombs for the resulting atomic war. All weapons except atomic explosives are to remain uncontrolled and each nation is to retain its army, navy, and air force. How practical is this plan and what chance is there of its general acceptance?

It has been claimed that by eliminating the veto the Baruch plan would insure effective enforcement action against a government violating the atomic agreement. I cannot agree. Here in new guise is the old fallacy that separate armed nations can find security by formally undertaking to use their respective armies jointly against any one of their number that commits aggression. It is an attempt to revive the impractical principles of the League of Nations and to graft them on to a veto-ridden United Nations. A mere change of voting rules in the Security Council can have no effect on the actions of the United States and Russia. If either chose to defy the international inspectors and seize the plants of the Authority, the result would be World War III, with the two giants and their satellites ranged against each other. No majority vote in the Security Council could disguise that reality or provide protection. It is even unlikely that such a vote could ever be taken. The seizure of atomic plants would be such a clear indication of aggressive designs that it would only be attempted in coordination with a general assault launched with rockets, blockbusters, bacteria, and mechanized armies. The victims of the attack would be more interested in defending themselves than in voting. Changes in the structure of the United Nations more fundamental than a juggling of voting rules in the Security Council are necessary, if the swift, certain, and sure system of punishment which Mr. Baruch called for is to be achieved.

Under the Baruch plan, veto or no veto, war would result from interference with the inspection system. The plan recognizes this fact by calling for a strategic balance of atomic plants among the nations. The number of plants and the amount of nuclear fuel within the borders of each nation will be an essential factor in its national security. If one nation seizes its plants to produce bombs, the others will be forced to seize theirs, and the side that has the largest atomic industry will have a considerable advantage in the resulting war. Agreement to a scheme determining the allocation of atomic industry is a prerequisite to the acceptance of the plan and such agreements extremely unlikely.

For instance, if the Soviet Government believed that the United States and the British Commonwealth would be allied against it in the event of another war, it could hardly agree to an equal division of atomic facilities among the three. Nor can I imagine either the United States or Britain consenting to a balance which would give the Russians as large an atomic industry as they owned together. Similarly, the number of atomic plants the United States might allow France for peaceful use would depend entirely upon the direction of French foreign policy. A victory at the polls for the French Communists would swing France into the Russian orbit. The United States would then be compelled to demand a revision of the balance or accept military inferiority when and if aggression occurred.

Agreement to a distribution scheme is further complicated by the impossibility of

equalizing the factors that condition the speed with which the various nations can convert to bomb production. The high level of industrialization, the technological skill, and the special experience of the United States with atomic energy combine to place this country for a long time at a distinct advantage in any sudden attempt to construct bombs. The Soviet Union might well hesitate to agree to a plan which upon the first violation would commit it to an atomic armament race which it would have little hope of winning against the technological superiority of the United States. Russia may prefer to continue unrestricted and secret competition for atomic weapons in the belief that an inferior supply of bombs is more protection than no bombs at all, if a potential enemy can construct them with greater speed than its own industrial efficiency permits. Even if accepted, the Baruch plan would only replace competition for bombs by an intense rivalry between the nations for the personnel and methods with which to produce bombs in the shortest possible time. Peace based on a balance of power has proved to be a brief truce between wars. Peace based on a nice balance of atomic power is not likely to be any more stable or enduring, whether that power exists as bombs ready for use or as plants capable of conversion within 3 months to bomb manufacture.

Another serious obstacle to the acceptance of the plan is the fact that under its provisions the nations are to remain free to compete for every weapon except bombs. With proper concern for American security, the Senate would be justified in refusing to destroy our atomic weapons except in conjunction with the demobilization of the Red Army and in return for material proof that Russia was not preparing for other types of specialized warfare. The Senate leaders have repeatedly demanded a fool-proof system of security in return for any surrender of atomic secrets. The Baruch plan is far from fool-proof. Each nation would retain as many millions of soldiers, as many mechanized divisions and biological weapons as it wished. Against a large nation armed with these forces, an attempt to punish a violation of the atomic agreement would result in a long and indecisive conflict. By agreeing to the Baruch plan, the United States would be giving up its one decisive weapon in return for the privilege of competing for other weapons where it has no advantage.

I hope this analysis of the plan will indicate why many of us in UWF believe that a more comprehensive and effective scheme is necessary, if there is to be any chance of acceptance by either the Russians or the United States Senate. The fatal defect of Mr. Baruch's proposal is the false assumption that atomic bombs can be prohibited while aggression in all its other forms remains possible. Security is indivisible and cannot be realized by attempting to ban one particular type of weapon. The first and only step toward the prevention of atomic warfare is the creation of an international organization powerful enough to prevent all war between nations. By specific amendments, the United Nations must be strengthened to the point where national preparation for war is not only unnecessary but impossible. The indispensable changes are briefly these:

First, the United Nations must be given the power to administer world laws binding the individual citizens of each country as their first duty. This constitutional authority must be strictly limited to those matters found essential to the preservation of peace. For example, the United Nations must be able to prohibit by binding enactment the manufacture or ownership by any national government of the means of organized warfare. It must be able to prohibit the use of force in the settlement of international disputes, and



it must be able to control and regulate the dangerous aspects of atomic development.

Secondly, the United Nations must have the power to arrest and try in world courts those who violate the basic security law. We need a procedure through which a Nuremberg trial can be held according to an established law before rather than after war has begun.

Thirdly, the United Nations must have the power to conduct an international system of inspection with free access into every country. It would be the task of the inspectors to discover any illegal attempt to produce the prohibited armament.

Fourthly, the United Nations must have not only the right to prohibit international war but the police power to enforce its authority. A world police force must be recruited from the individuals of each nation. It must be responsible only to the United Nations, armed with a monopoly on modern weapons, and strategically distributed. Until national governments are willing to give a world organization preponderant military power to keep the peace, they will be condemned to compete for arms among themselves.

These significant additions to the authority of the United Nations will necessitate certain changes in its internal structure. Particularly, the Security Council will cease to be legislator, prosecutor, judge, and jury. It will become an executive cabinet operating to administer the laws every nation has accepted as essential to the common security.

This would be world government, if you want to use the word. But it would be government only in a very limited area. Each nation would remain free to conduct its domestic affairs and foreign trade without restriction. The nations in agreeing to these amendments would be giving up only the right and means of annihilating each other.

There is but one way in which these changes can be made realities. As the Nation which first developed, employed and continues to manufacture atomic weapons, the United States has the responsibility for taking the initiative in proposing the formation of a strong United Nations. Our unilateral action in Greece and Turkey has been explained on the ground that the United Nations is not yet capable of assuming such a burden. But the United Nations cannot strengthen itself. It is a league of sovereign states and will remain impotent unless its members agree to give it the strength it needs. Through every available instrument of public information, the American people must be reached with the knowledge that they must choose between a suicidal war or a strong United Nations. An insistent and informed public demand must be brought to bear on the Government here in Washington.

But what of Russia? There are many who claim that the Soviet regime would reject any radical amendment of the United Nations and that the offer is not worth making. I am not so pessimistic. They have as much to lose as we do in a mutually devastating war. Faced with a choice between a desperate arms race ending in war and an effective system of security protecting them and us alike, the Kremlin leaders may well choose security. At least, until the Russians are given a fair opportunity to make the choice, we cannot tell whether the purpose of their present policy is aggression or defense. An American offer to erect an enforceable world law would be the only real test of Russian intentions. If they turned that down, we would be justified in assuming the worst. But let me repeat that I believe there is a good chance that they would accept.

I recognize that the changes necessary in traditional institutions are great and the time short. A shooting war may not be imminent but we are rapidly approaching a critical point when in preparation for conflict policies will have been adopted that

make war inescapable. Soon preparedness and propaganda will have swept both governments past all chance of turning back. While there is still time and room for hope, let us present to the people of this country the real choice, the destruction of civilized society or some measure of world government. When they understand that choice, I have confidence in their decision. Men are sufficiently rational to acquiesce in their own survival.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 15, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

678. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of proposed transfer to the State of Texas of U. S. S. *Texos* for maintenance by the State for historical purposes as a part of the San Jacinto battleground; to the Committee on Armed Services.

679. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill providing for participation by the United States in the Inter-American Commission of Women, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

680. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting a report with regard to the remodeling of the Senate and House caucus rooms and restaurants; to the Committee on Public Works.

681. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 248); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

682. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 249); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 310. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to permit the delivery of water from the District of Columbia and Arlington County water systems to the Falls Church or other water systems in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia in Virginia; without amendment (Rept. No. 378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. House Joint Resolution 193. Joint resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.; with amendments (Rept. No. 379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 144. Joint resolution providing for the compre-

hensive observance of the bicentennial of John Paul Jones; without amendment (Rept. No. 380). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 188. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces, World War II; without amendment (Rept. No. 381). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author; without amendment (Rept. No. 382). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CORBETT: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 170. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon; without amendment (Rept. No. 383). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 195. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain lands in Alaska to the city of Sitka, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 1826. A bill making it a petty offense to enter any national-forest land while it is closed to the public; without amendment (Rept. No. 385). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1341. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.; with amendments (Rept. No. 386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3215. A bill to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 3457. A bill to extend the benefits of title II of the Social Security Act to employees of States, political subdivisions thereof, and instrumentalities of States or political subdivisions, and to self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3458. A bill to reduce the retirement age and to increase benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3459. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits and to reduce the age requirement for old-age and survivors insurance benefits from 65 to 60 in the case of men and from 65 to 55 in the case of women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3460. A bill to extend the benefits of title II of the Social Security Act to employees of certain nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN (by request):

H. R. 3461. A bill to establish a procedure for facilitating the payment of certain Government checks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3462. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3463. A bill to authorize the construction of a chapel at the Coast Guard Academy, and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3464. A bill to provide for the mobilization of the scientific resources and knowledge of the United States for the purpose of seeking the causes and cure of cancer, heart disease, infantile paralysis, and other diseases of mankind; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 3465. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 3466. A bill to clarify and amend section 2 of the act of Congress of February 11, 1929, with respect to the granting of relief by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in cases in which certain special assessments have been paid and later held to be void or erroneous; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 3467. A bill for the relief of the city of Needles, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3468. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 so as to grant certain personnel equitable treatment in the matter of leave; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3469. A bill to promote the national security by providing for the coordination of all elements of national security, and for the reorganization of the military structure of the Nation to conform to the requirements of modern warfare; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 3470. A bill to provide for pilgrimages of gold-star mothers, sisters, and wives to the graves of their sons, brothers, and husbands who died in the service of the armed forces of the United States during World War II and who are buried in foreign lands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3471. A bill to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3472. A bill to provide disability benefits for persons who performed uncompensated services in the administration of the Selective Training and Service System and the emergency price control and rationing program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 3473. A bill to provide for nonrecognition of gain or loss in the case of anticipatory replacement of property condemned for public use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 3474. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to permit compensation or reimbursement in certain cases to persons acting in a representative or fiduciary capacity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Res. 211. A resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Public Works to conduct surveys of certain works of improvement; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3475. A bill for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

H. R. 3476. A bill for the relief of James J. O'Loughlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 3477. A bill for the relief of Mattia Racine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 3478. A bill for the relief of the California-Pacific Utilities Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

511. By Mr. KING: Petition signed by 64 residents of Inglewood, Calif., urging the passage of S. 265, which would prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

512. By Mr. KUNKEL: Petition relative to the Capper bill, S. 265, which penalizes interstate transmission, by mail or otherwise, of newspapers, periodicals, news reels, photographic films, or records advertising alcoholic beverages or soliciting orders therefor, advertising by radio being also prohibited, as well as the sending of circulars, letters, and so forth, into States which bar liquor advertisements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

513. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Mrs. Daisy McConnell and other members of the Methodist Church of Chariton, Iowa, in the interest of S. 265, S. 623, H. R. 142, and H. R. 2408; to the Committee on Armed Services.

514. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition forwarded by Mrs. A. J. Abing, route 3, Blissfield, Mich., and signed by 14 other residents of the community, urging favorable action on the Capper bill, S. 265, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

515. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of residents of Snow Hill, Md., urging passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising and broadcasting alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

516. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Lt. Robert P. Grover Post, No. 377, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Jersey City, N. J., opposing the enactment of H. R. 318, a bill to require certain persons within the United States to carry identification cards and be fingerprinted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 15, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Thou who art our merciful Heavenly Father upon earth, hear us as we tarry at the altar of prayer. We art Thine,

and Thou wilt surely hear us when we call and answer us when we pray.

"Made in His image" is the blessed word in the front door of the immortal Book. O direct us that we may never violate our sacred inheritance. Give us to understand that rich character is the offspring of unbiased meditation inspired by honest purpose. Grant that all decisions of this august body may be couched in wisdom; O keep us this day without sin and abide with all in the measure of a great peace.

In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 14, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, May 15, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

S. 874. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as Alternate Representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, to be reappointed to the Foreign Service.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon;

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces, World War II; and

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

#### REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF UNRRA (H. DOC. NO. 254)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.